DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 286 506 IR 052 111

AUTHOR Camerman, Virginia T.
TITLE A Survey of 154 Randomly Selected Libraries in the State of New York Concerning Their Acquisition and Treatment of Computer Software.
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 177p.; Requirement for the Certificate of Advanced Study Degree, State University of New York at Albany.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cataloging; *Computer Software; *Library Acquisition; *Library Circulation; Library Surveys; *Maintenance; Public Libraries; Questionnaires; School Libraries; Special Libraries; *Storage; Tables (Data); Users (Information)
IDENTIFIERS 3Rs; *New York

ABSTRACT

This report describes a study designed to determine whether the collection of computer software by libraries falls into a pattern of library type and whether patron use of computer software falls into a pattern of clientele type. Following a summary of previous research, a discussion of the study methodology describes a survey of 154 randomly selected public library systems, school library systems, and 3 R's (reference, research, and resource) councils in New York State to collect information on various aspects of library software acquisition, selection, cataloging, storage, handling, use, and circulation. Survey results obtained from 128 respondents (an 83.1% response rate) are presented in 152 tables. In addition, interpretations and conclusions drawn from results are both summarized and presented separately for the following survey respondents: (1) public libraries; (2) public school libraries; (3) non-public school libraries; (4) junior college libraries; (5) college libraries; (6) an army library; (7) government libraries; (8) government law libraries; (9) medical libraries; (10) library systems; (11) 3 R's councils; (12) school library systems; and (13) special libraries. Notes and a 19-item bibliography are provided, as well as the survey cover letter, follow-up cover letter, and questionnaire. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED286506

A SURVEY OF 154 RANDOMLY SELECTED LIBRARIES IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK CONCERNING THEIR ACQUISITION AND TREATMENT OF COMPUTER SOFTWARE

by

Virginia T. Camerman

Submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirement for

the Certificate of Advanced Study Degree

at

The School of Information Science and Policy

The State University of New York at Albany

LIS 780 Research Seminar
Dr. Joseph Morehead
Fall 1986

IO 521111

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Virginia T. Camerman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables i

Acknowledgements xi

Abstract 1

The Need to Know How Libraries Are Dealing With The Proliferation of Computer Software 2

1 -- Previous Research 4

User Surveys 5

Evaluation and Ordering of Software 7

Cataloging 7

Processing and Storing Software 15

Copyright of Software 15

Summary 16

2 -- Decision to Investigate Whether Libraries in New York State Are Collecting Computer Software 18

Method of Investigation 21

3 -- Tables Which Report Results of Survey 29

4 -- Interpretations and Conclusion 110

Public Libraries 123

Public School Libraries 124

Non Public High School Libraries 126

Junior College Libraries 127

College Libraries 128

Army Library 129

Government Libraries 129

Government Law Libraries 130

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Law Libraries 130

Medical Libraries 131

Library Systems 133

3 R's 135

School Library Systems 136

Special Libraries 140

Surveyor's Criticism of This Questionnaire and of This Survey 148

Footnotes 150

Bibliography 152

Appendix A -- Copy of Original Cover Letter 154

Appendix B -- Copy of Follow Up Cover Letter 155

Appendix C -- Copy of Software Questionnaire 156

LIST OF TABLES

Table		
1	Response to questionnaire mailed to 154 libraries in the State of New York during the first half of 1986	29
2	Libraries which responded to the survey	30
3	Responding libraries which indicate they have computer software	31
4	Surveyed libraries which purchase software	32
5	Surveyed libraries which indicate they have no software	33
6	Surveyed libraries which did not respond to questionnaire	34
7	Libraries which began purchasing software in 1986	35
8	Libraries which began purchasing software in 1985	35
9	Libraries which began purchasing software in 1984	36
10	Libraries which began purchasing software in 1983	36
11	Libraries which began purchasing software in 1982	37
12	Libraries which began purchasing software in 1981	37
13	Libraries which began purchasing software in 1980	37
14	Libraries which began purchasing software in 1979	38
15	Libraries which have purchased software, but which have not indicated first year of purchase	38
15a	Summary of Tables 7-15; library frequency and year libraries began purchasing software	38a
16	Libraries which purchase directly from producer	39

LIST OF TABLES

Table		
17	Libraries which purchase directly from agents, distributors or jobbers	40
18	Agents and producers from which surveyed libraries purchase software	41
19	Other ways in which some surveyed libraries acquire purchased software	43
20	Libraries which have received software as gifts	44
21	Libraries which received software as gifts in 1985	44
22	Libraries which received software as gifts in 1984	45
23	Libraries which received software as gifts in 1983	45
24	Libraries which received software as gifts in 1982	45
25	Libraries which received software as gifts in 1981	46
26	Libraries which received software as gifts, but did not indicate year of donation	46
27	Libraries which have been given software by individuals	47
28	Libraries which have been given software by the organization or agency of which library is a part	47
29	Libraries which have been given software by software producers	48
30	Libraries which have been given software by miscellaneous organizations	48
31	Characterization of various libraries' software	49
32	Libraries which are parts of larger institutions, which act as archives for computer software relating to their institutional operations	54

LIST OF TABLES

Table		
33	Libraries which use reviews for selecting software	55
34	Libraries which use staff suggestions as criteria for selecting software	56
35	Libraries which use patron suggestions as as selection criteria for selecting software	57
36	Libraries which preview software before buying it	57
37	Other criteria used by the various surveyed libraries for software selection	58
38	Journals used for software selection	60
39	Libraries which have applications programs, e.g., spreadsheets, word processing packages	62
40	Libraries which have database managers software	63
41	Libraries which acquire arcade games	63
42	Libraries which acquire educational games software	64
43	Libraries which acquire educational game software for all age levels	64
44	Libraries which acquire educational game software for age levels 2 - adult	64
45	Libraries which acquire educational game software for age levels 9-18 yrs	65
46	Libraries which acquire educational game software for age levels 10-18 yrs	
47	Libraries which acquire educational game software for age levels 12-14 yrs	65
48	Libraries which acquire educational game software for age levels 12-18 yrs	65
49	Libraries which acquire educational game software for elementary grade level	66

LIST OF TABLES

Table		
50	Libraries which acquire educational game software for grade levels K-6	66
51	Libraries which acquire educational game software for grade levels K-12	66
52	Libraries which acquire educational game software for primary-12th grade levels	66
53	Libraries which acquire educational game software for 7th-12th grade levels	67
54	Libraries which acquire educational game software for 8th-12th grade levels	67
55	Libraries which acquire curriculum supporting software	67
56	Libraries which acquire curriculum supporting software by grade levels K-12	68
57	Libraries which acquire curriculum supporting software by 3rd-12th grade levels	68
58	Libraries which acquire curriculum supporting software by 9th-10th grade levels	68
59	Libraries which acquire curriculum supporting software by 7th-12th grade levels	69
60	Libraries which acquire curriculum supporting software by 9th-12th grade levels	69
61	Libraries which acquire curriculum supporting software by 12 yrs up age level	69
62	Libraries which acquire curriculum supporting software by 12-18 yrs age levels	69
63	Libraries which acquire curriculum supporting software by 14-18 yrs age levels	70
64	Libraries which acquire curriculum supporting software by high school age level	70
65	Libraries which acquire curriculum supporting software by community college age level	70
66	Libraries which acquire curriculum supporting software by college age level	71

LIST OF TABLES

Table		
67	Libraries which acquire curriculum supporting software by college age level and up	71
68	Libraries which acquire computer-aided instruction programs	71
69	Libraries which acquire computer-aided instruction programs for age 10-adult levels	72
70	Libraries which acquire computer aided instruction programs for ages 12 yrs and up	72
71	Libraries which acquire computer-aided instruction programs for ages 12-18 yrs	72
72	Libraries which acquire computer-aided instruction programs for ages 14-18 yrs	72
73	Libraries which acquire computer-aided instruction programs for high school age level	73
74	Libraries which acquire computer-aided instruction programs for adults	73
75	Libraries which acquire computer-aided instruction programs for college age level	73
76	Libraries which acquire computer-aided instruction programs for college age level and up	74
77	Libraries which acquire computer-aided instruction programs for community college age level	74
78	Libraries which acquire computer-aided instruction programs for all age levels	74
79	Libraries which acquire computer-aided instruction programs for various age levels	74
80	Libraries which acquire computer-aided instruction programs for grade levels K-2	75
81	Libraries which acquire computer-aided instruction programs for grade levels K-12	75
82	Libraries which acquire computer-aided instruction programs for grade levels 6-8	75

LIST OF TABLES

Table		
83	Libraries which acquire computer-aided instruction programs for grade levels 7-12	76
84	Libraries which acquire computer-aided instruction programs for grade levels 8-12	76
85	Libraries which acquire computer-aided instruction programs for grade levels 9-10	76
86	Libraries which acquire computer-aided instruction programs for grade levels 9-12	77
87	Library which has SAT practice software	77
88	Libraries which collect computer software and have software cataloged by cataloging staff	78
89	Libraries which collect computer software and have software cataloged by persons other than cataloging staff	79
90	Libraries which collect computer software and have software cataloged either by cataloging staff or by other persons	80
91	Libraries which have computer software, but which do not catalog it	81
92	Libraries which catalog software according to the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, Second Edition, and its revisions	82
93	Libraries which do not catalog software according to the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, Second Edition, but follow some other guidelines for cataloging	83
94	Some reasons given for not cataloging computer software	84
95	Libraries which arrange software by Dewey classification number	85
96	Libraries which arrange software by Library of Congress classification number	85
97	Libraries which arrange software by both Library of Congress and National Library of Medicine classification numbers	86

LIST OF TABLES

Table		
98	Libraries which arrange their software by accession number	86
99	Libraries which keep their software at the computer	86
100	Libraries which house their software separately from their book collections	87
101	Libraries which keep all the components of a software package together	88
102	Libraries which separate accompanying materials from diskettes or tapes	89
103	Libraries which report library staff are the most frequent user type of libraries' software	90
104	Libraries which report students are the most frequent user type of libraries' software	91
105	Libraries which report instructional staff are the most frequent user type of libraries' software	91
106	Libraries which report the general public are the most frequent user type of libraries' software	92
107	Libraries which report computer user card holders are the most frequent user type of libraries' software	92
108	Libraries which report hospital staff are the most frequent user type of libraries' software	92
109	Libraries which report staff are the most frequent user type of libraries' software	93
110	Libraries which report the general public are the second most frequent user type of libraries' software	93
111	Libraries which report library staff are the second most frequent user type of libraries' software	93
112	Libraries which report instructional staff are the second most frequent user type of libraries' software	94

LIST OF TABLES

Table		
113	Libraries which report teachers are the second most frequent user type of libraries' software	94
114	Libraries which report staff are the second most frequent user type of libraries' software	94
115	Libraries which report faculty are the second most frequent user type of libraries' software	95
116	Libraries which report their computer staff are the second most frequent user type of libraries' software	95
117	Libraries which report hospital staff are the second most frequent user type of libraries' software	95
118	Libraries which report other employees are the second most frequent user type of libraries' software	96
119	Libraries which report other staff are the second most frequent user type of libraries' software	96
120	Libraries which report patrons are the second most frequent user type of libraries' software	96
121	Libraries which report library staff are the third most frequent user type of libraries' software	96
122	Libraries which report students are the third most frequent user type of libraries' software	97
123	Libraries which report instructional staff are the third most frequent user type of libraries' software	97
124	Libraries which report the general public are the third most frequent user type of libraries' software	97
125	Libraries which report computer user groups are the third most frequent user type of libraries' software	98
126	Libraries which report support staff are the third most frequent user type of libraries' software	98

LIST OF TABLES

Table		
127	Libraries which permit software to circulate (of the 65 libraries which have software)	99
128	Libraries which have maintenance problems with software and libraries which do not have maintenance problems with software	100
129	Libraries which have 1-20 diskettes	101
130	Libraries which have 21-78 diskettes	101
131	Libraries which have 125-200 diskettes	102
132	Libraries which have approximately 600 diskettes	102
133	Libraries which have 4-40 programs in diskette format	102
134	Libraries which have 100-117 programs in diskette format	103
135	Library which has 321 programs in diskette format for Apple, Atari, IBM	103
136	Library which has 150 disks and diskettes	103
137	Libraries which have 100% of their software in diskette format, but did not indicate number of programs or pieces	104
138	Library which has 4 packages only, but did not specify format	104
139	Libraries which have software in disk format and have 5-99 pieces	104
140	Library which has 1 program of Visifile	105
141	Library which has $300.00 of BPI Payroll	105
142	Library which has $150.00 of PFS File	105
143	Library which has $150.00 of PFS Write	105
144	Library which has 100% applications software	106
145	Library which has three programs of business software	106

LIST OF TABLES

Table		
146	Library which has 40 programs of educational software	106
147	Library which has 4 programs of library software	106
148	Library which has 1 program of library cataloging software	107
149	Library which has 1 program for word processor	107
150	Libraries which have 1-10 programs in cassette format	107
151	Library which has 16 software tapes	108
152	Libraries with plans to collect or not to collect microcomputer software and with plans to collect or not to collect computer software	109

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to take this opportunity to thank all those individuals who have aided me with this survey.

First, I thank Dr. Ben-Ami Lipetz of the School of Information Science and Policy of the State University of New York at Albany. Dr. Lipetz gave me continuing guidance throughout the course of this survey, from its inception through the final draft of this paper. I am grateful to Dr. Liptez for his many constructive suggestions.

Next, I thank Dr. Joseph Morehead, who is my advisor in the Certificate of Advanced Study Program at the School of Information Science and Policy at the State University of New York at Albany. Dr. Morehead also read the final draft of this paper. I thank Dr. Morehead for his many helpful suggestions regarding the revision of this paper.

I also wish to thank Soumaya Baaklini, Head of the Data bases Services Unit of the New York State Library. Mrs. Baaklini also read the final draft of this paper and I am grateful for her many useful suggestions regarding the revision of this paper.

I am indebted to Joe Mattie, Associate in Library Services, Division of Library Development of the New York State Library for providing me with the needed directories of libraries and library systems in New York State. Mr. Matties also provided me with the Directory of Nonpublic Schools and Administrators, New York State, 1984-1985, as well as with the Directory of

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Public Schools and Administrators in New York State, 1984-85. I also thank Joe Mattie for having reviewed the first draft of my questionnaire and for his suggestions concerning the wording and order of the questions.

I am grateful to all of the following individuals for having read the first draft of my questionnaire and for their suggestions concerning the wording and order of the questions. I wish to thank: GladysAnn Wells, Special Assistant to the State Librarian; Barbara Nichols Randall, Associate Librarian, Collection Acquisition and Processing, New York State Library; Carol Desch, Assistant in Library Services, Division of Library Development, New York State Library; Sharon Bonk of the State University of New York at Albany Library; Barbara Lockett, Head Librarian, Folsom Library, Rennselaer Polytechnic Institute; Marcia Middleton of the Albany Public Library; John Danek of the Niskayuna High School Library.

I also thank Susan H. Vita of the Library of Congress, whom I telephoned to verify whether there had been any published report of the LC Microcomputer Software Questionnaire which had been published in the RTSD Newsletter and for the information she gave me about the Library of Congress pilot cataloging in publication of microsoftware titles.

Last, but not least, I thank all those librarians who answered and returned the survey questionnaires.

ABSTRACT

A literature search was conducted to discover what had been written about computer software in libraries.

A partial survey of the literature which pertains to computer software in libraries is discussed in this paper. One microcomputer hardware and software survey and one microcomputer software questionnaire are mentioned. The reviewed literature includes both monographs and journal articles which explore the problems of cataloging and processing of software in libraries. The subject of software copyright is touched upon.

This surveyor's method of investigation is described, including the development and pretesting of the questionnaire. The random selection of libraries and systems included in this survey is reported.

One hundred and fifty-four randomly selected libraries, library systems, school library systems and 3 R's systems in New York State were surveyed. These libraries and systems were asked whether they have software, whether they purchase software and whether they catalog software. They were also asked whether they permit software to circulate and whether they have experienced software maintenance problems. These libraries and systems were asked how they store software.

One hundred and twenty-eight libraries (83.1%) of the 154 surveyed libraries and systems responded to this surveyor's questionnaire. The results of the survey are tabulated in many tables. The tabulated data is analyzed. Each kind of library or system is discussed.

THE NEED TO KNOW HOW LIBRARIES ARE DEALING WITH THE PROLIFERATION OF COMPUTER SOFTWARE

The increased use of home computers has led to a large increase in the commercial production of computer software. In this paper computer software is used to mean computer programs for any kind of computer, ranging from main frame computer to microcomputer and encompassing everything in between. During the month of March 1984, 39% of requests for ISBNs (International Standard Book Numbers) in the United States were from software producers.[1] Computer software appears in a variety of formats such as computer disks, floppy disks, diskettes, computer cassettes, computer cartridges, or computer tapes.

An increasing number of libraries are becoming involved with a variety of computer software. Some libraries are using computer software for management and/or business purposes, others are using computer software for technical service functions, while other libraries have acquired computer software for use by its patrons. A considerable variety of computer software already has been acquired by a number of libraries.

Library directors and technical services librarians of libraries that are anticipating future involvement with computer software can benefit from knowledge about other libraries that have had experience with computer software. If other libraries are acquiring significant amounts of computer soft-

ware, it would be useful to know how they are ordering the software, whether or not they are cataloging that software, how they are storing their computer software or if any computer software has been damaged. We need to know what the maintenance problems are and who the users are. It would be useful to learn if computer software collecting falls into any kind of pattern of library type and if patron use of computer software falls into any pattern of clientele type.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Some information is known about who the users of computer software in libraries are.

A few articles and parts of a few monographs have been written about the acquisition of computer software.

Several books and many articles have been written about the cataloging of computer software.

Very little has been written about the storage and maintenance problems of computer software in libraries.

Libraries cannot circulate computer software without considering copyright inplications. Fortunately a body of literature is developing which discusses the problems of copyright as it applies to computer software in libraries.

Each of these areas of the professional literature is discussed separately in the following pages.

User Surveys

In August 1984 the R. R. Bowker Company released the results of a survey about microcomputer hardware and software usage in American libraries. 3,500 public, college/university, high school, elementary school and special libraries were surveyed. The surveyed libraries were public, private and those of parochial institutions. The Bowker study indicated that approximately two-thirds of U.S. libraries which have microcomputers allow public or student use of those microcomputers. The usage of these microcomputers was mainly limited to use within the libraries. At the time of that survey only 2.5% of the libraries were lending microcomputers for use outside their buildings. 59% of the libraries loaned software to patrons for use within the library. 19.8% of the libraries in the Bowker study permitted use of their computer software outside their libraries.

The Bowker survey informs us that in 1984 college/university libraries were the leading users of microcomputers (51.0%), followed by high school libraries (41.1%), special libraries (37.1%), and elementary-school libraries (31.5%). This study reports that public libraries (26.0%) were using microcomputers the least.[2]

A LC Microcomputer Software Questionnaire was published in Vol. 10, no. 2 (1985) of the RTSD Newsletter, pp. 14-15. The readers of this survey were requested to return the questionnaire to the Library of Congress. There was no attempt "to achieve a statistically selected sample; respondents will

be self-selected." This survey was made so the Library of Congress, Cataloging in Publication Division would have enough information to prepare for a "one-year pilot that will include one thousand microsoftware titles in the Cataloging in Publication [CIP] Program." The pilot was to begin January 1986.

The writer of this report telephoned Susan H. Vita at the Library of Congress on Oct. 29, 1986, since Susan H. Vita is the individual who placed the questionnaire in the RTSD Newsletter. Susan Vita said she had given an oral report on the LC microcomputer software survey in Atlanta in March of 1986, but that no report of this survey has been published. Susan Vita also stated that the Library of Congress pilot cataloging in publication of microsoftware titles will begin in January 1987. Ms. Vita indicated that this pilot cataloging in publication of microsoftware titles theoretically will last for one year, but there is a possibility this pilot might last indefinitely.

Evaluation and Ordering of Software

Microcomputer Software and Hardware; an Annotated Source List, How to Obtain, How to Evaluate, How to Catalog, How to Standardize[3] by the American Association of School Libraries Committe for Standardization of Access to Library Media is an excellent reference. Its sections on how to obtain and how to evaluate microcomputer software may be especially useful.

Cataloging

A number of articles and some monographs have been written about the cataloging of computer software. Some of the articles and some of the books will be referred to here.

"Cataloging Software"[4] by M. Dumlao and S. Cook is about the cataloging of computer programs produced for internal use by the Bechtel Corporation and the generation of the "Bechtel Catalog of Computer Programs". This article would be useful to librarians who catalog the internally produced computer programs of their own organizations.

Marilyn Nasatir in her article "The Cataloging and Classification of Machine-Readable Data Files. Part I: A Case for Incorporating Records of Machine-Readable Data Files into the Public Catalog"[5] argues that the existence and availability of of machine-readable-data files ought to be made known through the creation of a bibliographic record in a library's public catalog.

Sheila Intner indicates that catalogers who catalog machine-readable materials realize the rules of Chapter 9 of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, Second Edition, are inadequate for cataloging certain kinds of software. In her article "Suggestions for the Cataloging of Machine-Readable Materials"[6] Intner recounts some of the problems encountered in a course she taught in cataloging nonprint materials when a "student elected to devise temporary entries for a collection of diskettes." Intner recounts the question raised when applying Chapter 9 rules to the cataloging of this collection of "floppy diskettes" and has made some specific suggestions for changes in the rules of Chapter 9. Intner concludes that the constantly changing technology of software production and the variety of machine readable and "self-produced materials" compose such a variety that more flexibility is required of the rules for cataloging these materials.

The Guidelines for Using AACR2 Chapter 9 for Cataloging Microcomputer Software,[7] which interprets some of the more difficult areas of Chapter 9 of AACR2, is useful only for the cataloging of commercially produced software.

Sue A. Dodd's article, "Changing AACR2 to Accommodate the Cataloging of Microcomputer Software"[8] examines "the rules affected by revisions approved by the Joint Steering Committee and those covered by the new Guidelines for Using AACR2 Chapter 9 for Cataloging Micrcomputer Software" and also explores additional changes required "to provide adequate bibliographical

control" of microcomputer software.

Sheila Intner in her article "Problems and Solutions in Descriptive Cataloging of Microcrocomputer Software"[9] explores some of the difficulties in cataloging microcomputer software when applying the rules of Chapter 9 and then indicates how these problems were accommodated in the Guidelines. Three problems are: "naming the media group", "providing a meaningful physical description" and "selecting appropriate additional data which might be represented in the note area". Intner points out that one of the limitations of the Guidelines is that they apply only to commercially produced software. Intner suggests the "most effective remedy" produced by the Guidelines is the indication in the note area of which hardware is compatible with the software represented by a particular bibliographic record. Enough information should be provided in the note area so users are able to decide if a program can be used with a particular kind of hardware.

Marilyn Nasatir in her paper "The Cataloging and Classification of Machine-Readable Data Files. Part III: Subject Description of Machine-Readable Files"[10] considers the feasibility of using Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) 8th ed., 1975 to describe machine-readable data files (MRDF). Nasatir conducted "a preliminary test of MRDF subject cataloging" in which "six studies were selected from the catalog of MRDF of one of the major data archives in the country, the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR),

to see if they could be described by subject terms from LCSH and to see if the applicable terms might fall into a particular level of a hierarchical structure of terms." Nasatir believes some of the broader terms and "subdivision capability" of LCSH would enable a cataloger to combine several elements of a MDRF title into a single tracing. Based on studies performed by other individuals, Nasatir says that subject searches tend to be successful when title words are used in subject headings and that there is a need to "coordinate the consistent use of standard terms in catalogs and reference materials of institutions, archives and agencies which provide information about and/or access to MRDF."

In January 1984, the ALA/CCS Subject Analysis Committee appointed a subcommittee to study subject access to microcomputer software. Joan S. Mitchell in her article "Subject Access to Microcomputer Software"[11] discusses the preliminary set of objectives identified by that subcommittee, the problems of subject access to microcomputer software and the work of that subcommittee. The preliminary objectives of that subcommittee are: that the entire bibliographical record should provide the access needed by the user, that sound practice of subject analysis and classification be followed and that one must be sure adequate subject heading and linkage exist in the Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) and that LC classification and the Dewey Decimal Classification tables have adequate provisions for the subjects covered by microcomputer

software. The subcommittee studied the Guidelines for Using AACR2 Chapter 9 for Cataloging Microcomputer Software to determine the access provided by descriptive cataloging. Since this information is provided in the descriptive cataloging of a bibliographic record, the question is asked if it makes sense to assign subject headings for a computer model, programming language and operating system associated with each item cataloged. The subject subcommittee believes the subject content of the software being cataloged should be regarded no differently from other materials being cataloged. "The criteria for assigning subject headings and classification to microcomputer software" should be the same as that for other library materials. There was a problem with the LCSH free floating subdivision "Computer programs" because it is hard to distinguish between books "containing listings of programs and the software itself." Several alternatives are under consideration to clarify this ambiguity. Within the LC classification scheme or the Dewey Decimal Classification system, software should be classified according to topic or subject in the same manner as one would classify a book. If software is arranged by accession number or classified only by its software form it is felt an unwieldy collection of material unrelated by subject will develop. The last objective of the subcommittee is to make sure that the structure of LCSH is "adequate for the subject analysis of microcomputer software."

The questions are raised: Will LCSH provide new headings for microcomputer software soon enough? Will there be adequate linkage by providing enough see and see also references? There are two developments which may help. One is the recent publication of "L.C. Subject Headings Weekly Lists" and the other development is a recent LC policy which "prohibits unlinked (orphan) headings in most instances". This will not help with unlinked headings created before the implementation of the new "linking" policy, but this new policy will help with the new headings. A new revision of the Dewey Decimal computer science schedule (004-006) is imminent. A standard subdivision for computer software will be included in this new schedule so software can be classified by subject and a form division added to a classification number to indicate that the material being cataloged is software. The new guidelines on subject headings and classification of computer software written by this subcommittee should help establish a national standard for subject access to microcomputer software. It is interesting to learn from this article that the new MARC format for machine-readable data files (MRDF) was implemented by OCLC in October 1984.

Sue Dodd's book, Cataloging Machine Readable Data Files[12] gives very sound advice on how to gain information about a MRDF (machine readable data file) so it can be adequately described and how to distinguish between certain kinds of information such as a production date and a distribution date.

Dodd clearly explains that the generic term machine-readable data files can be broken down into two categories. One category is data files; the second category is computer software programs. Dodd divides the second category, computer software programs, into two subcategories: program files and object programs. Dodd also describes in great detail the various aspects of a machine readable data file a cataloger would have to understand in order to catalog such a file. Dodd has devoted a chapter of this book to "step by step cataloging examples". Examples are often very useful supplements to a text. Dodd has also supplied a checklist for cataloging MRDF.

Sue Dodd and Ann. M. Sandberg-Fox have written the monograph, Cataloging Microcomputer Files: a Manual of Interpretation for AACR2.[13] We are told the main purpose of this manual is to assist librarians in the understanding and application of Chapter 9 of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, 2nd ed., and the Guidelines for Using AACR2 Chapter 9 for Cataloging Microcomputer Software. This monograph discusses the various problems associated with the cataloging of software, explains the various components of a microcomputer system, the various types of software, explains the terminology and analyzes Chapter 9 and the Guidelines. There is also a chapter on classification, one on subject cataloging and another chapter on step-by-step cataloging. A cataloger who catalogs microcomputer software would gain greater under-

standing of microcomputer files after having read this book.

In her book, Cataloging of Audiovisual Materials; a Manual Based on AACR2[14] Nancy B. Olson devotes chapter 6 to the cataloging of microcomputer software. Olson discusses AACR2, Chapter 9, as it applies to microcomputer software. Olson suggests access to microcomputer models by assigning subject headings to the microcomputer models. She also provides good examples of cataloging.

Sue Dodd suggests the use of a "systems requirements" note while Nancy Olson suggests subject headings to provide access to a particular make or model of a microcomputer. Dodd points out that "most operating systems are designed to be operational with a particular make and model of a machine, but others are designed to be interchangable and run on more than one machine ... " In this circumstance a "systems requirements" note would make more sense.

The RTSD Regional Institute on Nonbook Materials was offered in several locations in the United States in 1985. This RTSD Regional Institute on Nonbook Materials was held in Boston, Massachusetts, Dec. 9-11, 1985. Nancy Olson conducted one session on cataloging microcomputer software and Sue Dodd conducted another session on the cataloging of machine-readable data files using Chapter 9.

The participants in these sessions had the opportunity to examine some software and were shown many different examples of

problems encountered when cataloging software. Participants were free to ask questions. Anyone who catalogs software would have found these sessions very instructive.

Processing and Storing Software

The Guidelines for Processing and Cataloging Computer Software for Schools and Area Education Agencies[15] by E. Martin offers guidelines for cataloging software. Suggestions are also made regarding the preparation of circulation records and the storage of software.

Nancy Olson in her Cataloging of Audiovisual Materials advises what not to do when processing microcomputer software. She writes that paper clips should be avoided, that labels added to a disk can "peel back slightly, as can the write-protect tabs, catching in the slim new disk drives". Olson also indicates that automated check-out devices and theft-protection systems may be harmful to software.

The Copyright of Software

A number of libraries are already circulating software, especially microcomputer software. A corpus of literature is beginning to develop over the problems of copyright as it applies to software. Libraries cannot circulate software without considering copyright implications. Some of these enlightening articles are: "Copyright, Microsoftware, and the Library Media Center"[16] by Rosemary Sturdevant Talab, "The Circulation of Microcomputer Software in Academic Libraries and Copyright Implications"[17] by David B. Walsh, "Software, Librar-

ies, & the Copyright Law"[18] by Susan L. Lytle and Hal. W. Hall and "Software Copyright & Copy Protection; Laser Disk Systems at ALA"[19] by Robert M. Mason.

Summary

There is not a great body of literature about the ordering of software. However, as more libraries acquire software, it would seem more literature will develop in this area.

Although more literature has been written about the evaluation of software than has been mentioned in this paper, more needs to be known about this subject.

Judging from the number of monographs and articles written on the subject of cataloging software, one may conclude that a large body of opinion agrees that software ought to be cataloged. If a library does not belong to a consortium or a network, so that other libraries do not need access to its bibliographical records, then that library might be able to have very simple cataloging for its software. However, if a library belongs to an online network such as OCLC it is necessary to catalog software according to the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, 2nd edition so the library will conform to the cataloging rules followed by participating libraries.

There is a paucity of literature on the circulation of software, as there is about the maintenance and storage problems of software. As more experience in these aspects of software are acquired, it would be expected that more literature will be written on these subjects.

Some articles have been written about the copyright implications of lending software and other copyright problems concerning software. These themes will probably be of continuing interest, and we can expect more literature to be written in these areas as well.

As software technology, as it applies to libraries and library related problems, evolves so will the related literature.

DECISION TO INVESTIGATE WHETHER LIBRARIES IN NEW YORK STATE ARE COLLECTING COMPUTER SOFTWARE

During the Fall of 1984, this writer took a proseminar in research methods from Dr. Ben-Ami Lipetz of the School of Information Science and Policy at the State University of New York at Albany. A requirement of that proseminar was to write a research proposal. This writer spend much time reviewing what might be both a legitimate and interesting research proposal. During a conversation with Dr. Lipetz, Dr. Lipetz mentioned he had learned that a large number of ISBN's (International Standard Book Numbers) were being issued for computer software. This discussion developed into Dr. Lipetz's wondering whether many libraries were acquiring computer software and whether libraries which had purchased computer software were having it cataloged. At that time this writer seized upon Dr. Lipetz's questions and declared it would be interesting to write a research proposal to survey some libraries in New York State to find out whether some libraries were indeed acquiring computer software, whether computer software was being cataloged, how it was being stored and whether computer software was being circulated. Dr. Lipetz agreed this was a useful research topic so this writer chose this subject for her research proposal. After having written the research proposal for Dr. Lipetz's proseminar, it seemed logical to do an actual survey.

Much is to be learned about computer software collections in libraries. There are a host of questions to be answered. How many libraries are currently acquiring computer software? How are the libraries acquiring their computer software if they have any? In what years did libraries begin to acquire computer software? What kinds of computer software are being collected by libraries? What criteria are being used for the selection of computer software? If reviews are used, what journals are used? If computer software is being cataloged, who is cataloging it? What cataloging rules or guidelines are being followed? How are libraries arranging their computer software? Are libraries housing their software separately from their book collections? How are libraries handling the components of computer software packages? Do libraries permit their computer software to circulate beyond their library's premises? What are libraries' maintenance problems with their software? Who are the most frequent users of libraries' software? What are the sizes of computer software collections in various libraries? In what formats are libraries' software collections? If libraries are not currently collecting computer software, when do they expect to begin? These are all very interesting questions.

Since this writer is a resident of New York State and at the inception of this survey, had no experience in conducting a survey, it was desirable to survey a small number of libraries and it seemed logical to limit the survey to the con-

fines of New York State. Once the decision was made to conduct a survey of computer software in libraries within the boundaries of New York State, this neophyte surveyor consult- Dr. Ben-Ami Lipetz on how to get organized and how to begin. The method of investigation is discussed in the following pages.

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

It was decided to have a random sampling of libraries in New York State which would represent as many types of libraries as possible, excluding elementary schools.

The libraries which were to comprise the randomly selected list were chosen from several different sources.

The first group of approximately 100 libraries was selected from the American Library Directory, 38th edition, published in 1985. The number of entries on one page was multiplied by the number of pages in the New York State section of the directory. The total number of estimated entries was divided by 100. It was decided to begin the random selection on page 3 and to select the last entry in the left hand column. It was also decided to select a library from two consecutive pages, last entry in the left hand column and and then to skip the third page. This process was repeated until a list of 110 libraries had been selected. However, four of those libraries which were randomly selected were not appropriate because one which was associated with a major library was not physically located in the state of New York, and the other three libraries were small libraries of religious materials and were associated with religious institutions and were not likely to have any software. These four libraries were removed from the list of randomly selected libraries. Therefore 106 libraries to be surveyed were selected from the American Library Directory.

Three public library systems were to be included in the survey. It was decided that the directors of these public library systems should be directors only of their respective public library systems and not simultaneously directors of member libraries. The writer of this paper consulted Joe Mattie, Associate in Library Service, Division of Library Development of the New York State Library, to determine which public library system directors fell into the required category. The names of appropriate public library systems were taken from the 1985 Directory of Library Systems in New York State. The names were written on slips of paper and stirred in a bowl. The surveyor then pulled out three slips of paper. The three public library systems written on those slips of paper were incorporated into the list of libraries to be surveyed.

It was also decided to survey three reference and research library resource systems (3Rs). The names of these systems were also taken from the 1985 Directory of Library Systems in New York State. Again the system names were written on slips of paper and stirred in a bowl, and three slips of paper were picked from the bowl. The names of the 3R systems written on those three slips of paper were incorporated into the list of libraries to be surveyed.

The names of three pilot school library systems and three non pilot school library systems were to be incorporated into the list of libraries to be surveyed. Again

this surveyor consulted Joe Mattie who provided a Sept. 11, 1985 list of School Library System Coordinators and their systems. The names were randomly selected in the same manner as library systems and 3R systems. The addresses of the school library systems were obtained from the 1985 Directory of Library Systems in New York State.

It was also decided to include 30 public high school libraries in the survey. The Directory of Public Schools and Administrators in New York State, 1984-85 was used as a selection tool. The number of school districts listed on pages vii-xvi were estimated to be approximately 773. This sum was divided by 30. The 25th entry in the first column was selected and then the 50th entry and then the 75th entry in the next column. This pattern was followed throughout the school district selection process. The table which lists the school districts also lists a district's county. For instance, the Arlington School District is located in Arlington County. After a school district had been randomly selected it was necessary to select a high school. The surveyor turned to the county section of the directory and located the previously selected school district and selected the high school first listed in the list of schools for the desired district. In several cases only central schools were listed under a district name. In these instances the surveyor telephoned the school to determine what grades were enrolled in the school. In each of these cases, a central school included grades K-12. The 30 randomly selected high school or central

school names were added to the list of libraries to be surveyed.

It was also decided to survey six nonpublic high school libraries. The Directory of Nonpublic Schools and Administrators, New York State, 1984-85 was used as a selection source for obtaining nonpublic high school names. The Directory of Nonpublic Schools and Administrators, New York State is arranged alphabetically by county. The high schools are listed as a group within the county. It was estimated 508 nonpublic high schools are listed in this directory. This sum was divided by 6, so the surveyor listed every 84th high school. At the end of this process, 6 nonpublic high schools were added to the list of libraries to be surveyed. Now the list was complete and consisted of 154 libraries.

The surveyor then constructed the first draft of the questionnaire. The questionnaire asked if a library acquired computer software, if the computer software was internally produced or bought from a commercial producer or vendor, or acquired gratis, if the computer software had been cataloged, if the 2nd edition of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules is used, how the software has been stored, if any software has been damaged, what kinds of patrons use the computer software, if the computer software is for use only within a library or if computer software is circulated. The RTSD Newsletter, Vol. 10, no. 2 (1985), pp. 14-15, contains the LC Microcomputer Software Questionnaire. This surveyor borrowed liber-

ally from the LC Microcomputer Software Questionnaire. The LC question 5 became question 8, LC question 13 was slightly altered and became question 11.

Once the first draft of the questionnaire had been written, the surveyor consulted Dr. Lipetz. Some questions were reworded and the sequence of some questions altered according to the suggestions made by Dr. Lipetz. Finally a second draft of the questionnaire was constructed.

After the second draft of the questionnaire had been constructed, the surveyor pretested it by showing it to various individuals and asking them if they thought the questions were clearly written or if they could make any suggestions for improving the questionnaire. The following persons were asked to read and to evaluate the questionnaire: Barbara Nichols Randall, Associate Librarian in Collection Acquisition and Processing, New York State Library; GladysAnn Wells, Special Assistant to the State Librarian; Joe Mattie, Associate in Library Services, Division of Library Development, New York State Library; Carol Desch, Assistant in Library Services, Division of Library Development, New York State Library; Sharon Bonk of the State University of New York at Albany, Library; Barbara Lockett, Head of the Folsom Library at Rennselaer Polytechnic Institute; Marcia Middleton of the Albany Public Library and John Danek of the Niskayuna High School Library.

After the previously mentioned individuals had reviewed

the second draft of the questionnaire, the surveyor again consulted Dr. Lipetz regarding their suggestions and constructive criticisms. Improvements were made in the questionnaire. The surveyor also consulted Dr. Lipetz about the wording of the cover letter. Finally both the questionnaire and the cover letter were typed and reproduced. The envelopes were addressed, stamped and stuffed.

The questionnaires were mailed in two groups. On Jan. 14, 1986, the first group of questionnaires, together with a cover letter and stamped, self addressed envelopes were mailed to the libraries to be surveyed. The questionnaires were assigned numbers which corresponded to numbering assigned to individual libraries and recorded in the surveyor's notebook. These numbers were also recorded on the stamped self-addressed envelopes to be used for returning the questionnaires. As the questionnaires were returned, the date received was recorded next to the replying library's name in the surveyor's notebook. Six weeks later a follow-up cover letter and and a second copy of the questionnaire were mailed together with a stamped, self-addressed envelope to each library which had not responded to the original questionnaire.

On February 6, 1986 questionnaires together with cover letters and stamped, self-addressed envelopes were mailed to the second group of libraries which consisted of school library systems, public jr./sr. high schools, public high schools and six nonpublic high schools. As in the previous mailing, the questionnaires and stamped self-addressed enve-

lopes were assigned numbers which corresponded to the respective numbers assigned to each library and recorded in the surveyor's notebook. As the questionnaires were returned, the receipt date was recorded in the surveyor's notebook. On March 22, 1986 folow-up questionnaires and cover letters were mailed to the libraries in this second group which had not yet responded to the first copy of the questionnaire.

An 8x5 card was prepared and assigned each library which responded to the survey so that data from each returned questionnaire could be transferred to a particular card representing a particular library. An 8x5 card was typed for each part of each question on the questionnaire. Library types were recorded on this card. Information was also transferred from the questionnaires to these 8x5 cards. After cards were prepared in this manner, the cards could be manipulated in many combinations and it was also possible to double check the tabulations. Finally the analyzing of data could be begun.

In some tables of data, library sizes have been indicated. These statistics were taken from the American Library Directory, 38th ed. (1985). If book titles for a library or both book titles and book volumes have been indicated for a library in this directory, a library's size will be referred to by book titles. In some instances, only book volumes have indicated a library's size in this directory. In this instance, only book volumes have been used to indicate a library's size. This is the reason some libraries' sizes

are referred to by book title and other libraries' sizes are referred to by book volume. The surveyor also categorized libraries by the designations used in the American Library Directory, e.g. public library, governmental law library, or medical library.

The school libraries and school system libraries are not listed in the American Library Directory and the sources used to select these libraries do not indicate size. Therefore, when the surveyor has referred to the sizes of these kinds of libraries, the size has been reported as unknown.

Tabulations of the data collected from this survey are listed in the following pages. The pages of tabulations are followed by an interpretation of the tabulated data.

Table 1

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONNAIRE MAILED TO 154 LIBRARIES IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK DURING THE FIRST HALF OF 1986*

kind of library	responding libraries		non-responding libraries		total survey	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
army	1	100.0	-	-	1	100.0
college	8	72.7	3	27.3	11	100.0
government	2	50.0	2	50.0	4	100.0
government law	2	100.0	-	-	2	100.0
junior college	6	85.7	1	14.3	7	100.0
law	1	100.0	-	-	1	100.0
library system	4	100.0	-	-	4	100.0
medical	7	100.0	-	-	7	100.0
nonpublic high school	4	66.7	2	33.3	6	100.0
public high school	15	79.0	4	21.0	19	100.0
public jr./sr. high school	6	75.0	2	25.0	8	100.0
public library	37	92.5	3	7.5	40	100.0
public school K-12	3	100.0	-	-	3	100.0
3 R's	3	100.0	-	-	3	100.0
school library system	4	66.7	2	33.3	6	100.0
special library	25	78.1	7	21.9	32	100.0
total	128	83.1	26	16.9	154	100.0

* The column percentages of responding and nonresponding libraries are percentaged within the kind of library, e.g., 37 out of 40 public libraries surveyed responded to the questionnaire.

f=frequency

Table 2

LIBRARIES WHICH RESPONDED TO QUESTIONNAIRE*

kind of library	libraries with software		libraries without software		all responding libraries	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
army	1	100.0	-	-	1	100.0
college	5	62.5	3	37.5	8	100.0
government	-	-	2	100.0	2	100.0
government law	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	100.0
junior college	3	50.0	3	50.0	6	100.0
law	1	100.0	-	-	1	100.0
library system	4	100.0	-	-	4	100.0
medical	1	14.3	6	85.7	7	100.0
nonpublic high school	2	50.0	2	50.0	4	100.0
public high school	11	73.3	4	26.7	15	100.0
public jr./sr. high school	4	66.7	2	33.3	6	100.0
public library	21	56.8	16	43.2	37	100.0
public school K-12	1	33.3	2	66.7	3	100.0
3 R's	3	100.0	-	-	3	100.0
school library system	2	50.0	2	50.0	4	100.0
special library	5	20.0	20	80.0	25	100.0
total	65	50.8	63	49.2	128	100.0

* The column percentages of responding libraries are percentaged within the kind of library, e.g., 21 out of 37 responding public libraries have computer software.

f=frequency

Table 3

RESPONDING LIBRARIES WHICH INDICATE THEY HAVE COMPUTER SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response *
army	1	.8
college	5	3.9
governmental law	1	.8
junior college	3	2.3
law	1	.8
library system	4	3.1
medical	1	.8
nonpublic high school	2	1.6
public high school	11	8.6
public jr./sr. high school	4	3.1
public library	21	16.4
public school K-12	1	.8
3R's	3	2.3
school library system	2	1.6
special library	5	3.9
total which have computer software	65	50.8

* total response is 128 libraries

Table 4

SURVEYED LIBRARIES WHICH PURCHASE SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response*	size of library
army	1	.8	18,000 bk vols.
college	3	2.3	1 library: bk titles: 490,000; 2 libraries: bk. vols.: 160,840-334,000
government law	1	.8	44,000 bk vols.
junior college	2	1.6	bk titles: 65,596-108,440
law	1	.8	bk titles: 24,000
library system	3	2.3	bk titles: 48,120-138,265
medical	1	.8	bk titles: 5,000
nonpublic high school	2	1.6	bk titles and bk vols. unknown
public high school	9	7.0	bk titles and bk vols. unknown
public jr./sr. high school	4	3.1	bk titles and bk vols. unknown
public library	18	14.0	8 libraries: bk titles: 24,200-150,838; 10 libraries: bk vols.: 13,907-1,513,906
public school K-12	1	.8	bk titles and bk vols. unknown
3R's	3	2.3	bk titles and bk vols. unknown
school library system	2	1.6	bk titles and bk vols. unknown
special library	5	3.9	1 library: bk titles: 4,100; 3 lib.: bk vols: 862-25,000; 1 lib.: bd. vols. & per.: 110,000
total which purchase computer software	56	43.7	

* total response is 128 libraries

Table 5

SURVEYED LIBRARIES WHICH INDICATE
THEY HAVE NO SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response *	size of library
college	3	2.3	1 library: 145,000 bk vols.; size of other 2 libraries unknown
government	2	1.6	bk titles: 764-23,000
government law	1	.8	bk vols.: 15,000
junior college	3	2.3	2 libraries: bk titles: 37,000-41,253; 1 library: bk vols.: 55,016
medical	6	4.7	5 libraries: bk titles: 750-14,956; 1 library: bk vols.: 7,200
nonpublic high school	2	1.6	bk titles and bk vols. unknown
public high school	4	3.1	bk titles and bk vols. unknown
public jr./sr. high school	2	1.6	bk titles and bk vols. unknown
public library	16	12.5	5 libraries: bk titles: 5,358-104,529; 10 libraries: bk vols.: 4,206-72,112; 1 library: size unknown
public school K-12	2	1.6	bk titles and bk vols. unknown
school library system	2	1.6	bk titles and bk vols. unknown
special library	20	15.6	11 libraries: bk titles: 50-40,500; 9 libraries: bk vols.: 6,000-20,000
total which do not have computer software	63	49.2	

* total response is 128 libraries

Table 6

SURVEYED LIBRARIES WHICH DID NOT RESPOND TO QUESTIONNAIRE

kind of library	frequency	% of total survey*	size of library
college	3	1.9	1 library: bk titles: 170,000; 2 libraries: bk vols.: 14,623-89,704
government	2	1.3	1 library: bk vols.: 1,000; 1 library: bk vols.: 2,600, bd. docs.: 12,000
junior college	1	.6	bk vols.: 44,038
nonpublic high school	2	1.3	bk titles and bk vols. unknown
public high school	4	2.6	bk titles and bk vols. unknown
public jr./sr. high school	2	1.3	bk titles and bk vols. unknown
public library	3	1.9	2 libraries: bk vols.: 3,528-5,303; 1 library: size unknown
school library system	2	1.3	bk titles and bk vols. unknown
special library	7	4.5	5 libraries: bk titles: 100-13,000; 1 library: bk vols.: 3,000; 1 library: size unknown
total	26	16.9	

* 154 libraries were surveyed

Table 7

LIBRARIES WHICH BEGAN PURCHASING SOFTWARE IN 1986

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
army	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 8

LIBRARIES WHICH BEGAN PURCHASING SOFTWARE IN 1985

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	7	5.5
special	3	2.3
college	2	1.6
public high school	2	1.6
government law	1	.8
medical	1	.8
school library system	1	.8
total	17	13.3

Table 9

LIBRARIES WHICH BEGAN PURCHASING SOFTWARE IN 1984

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	4	3.1
public high school	2	1.6
special library	1	.8
public jr./sr. high school	1	.8
nonpublic high school	1	.8
law library	1	.8
college	1	.8
public school K-12	1	.8
total	12	9.4

Table 10

LIBRARIES WHICH BEGAN PURCHASING SOFTWARE IN 1983

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	3	2.3
public jr./sr. high school	3	2.3
public high school	3	2.3
library system	1	.8
school library system	2/3	.5
total	10 2/3	8.3

Table 11

LIBRARIES WHICH BEGAN PURCHASING SOFTWARE IN 1982

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
junior college	1	.8
public high school	1	.8
public library	1	.8
total	3	2.3

Table 12

LIBRARIES WHICH BEGAN PURCHASING SOFTWARE IN 1981

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
library system	1	.8
3R's	1	.8
school library system	1/3	.3
total	2 1/3	1.8

Table 13

LIBRARIES WHICH BEGAN PURCHASING SOFTWARE IN 1980

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	2	1.6
total	2	1.6

Table 14

LIBRARIES WHICH BEGAN PURCHASING SOFTWARE IN 1979

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 15

LIBRARIES WHICH HAVE PURCHASED SOFTWARE, BUT WHICH HAVE NOT INDICATED FIRST YEAR OF PURCHASE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
college	1	.8
junior college	1	.8
library system	1	.8
nonpublic high school	1	.8
public high school	1	.8
3R's	2	1.6
total	7	5.6

Table 15a

SUMMARY OF TABLES 7-15
LIBRARY FREQUENCY AND YEAR LIBRARIES BEGAN PURCHASING SOFTWARE

kind of library	1986	1985	1984	1983	1982	1981	1980	1979	unknown	total
army	1									1
college		2	1						1	4
government										0
government law		1								1
junior college					1				1	2
law			1							1
library system				1		1			1	3
medical		1								1
nonpublic high school			1						1	2
public high school		2	2	3	1				1	9
public jr./sr. high school			1	3						4
public library		7	4	3	1		2	1		18
public school K-12			1							1
3 R's						1			2	3
school library system		1		2/3		1/3				2
special library		3	1							4
total	1	17	12	10 2/3	3	2 1/3	2	1	7	56

Table 16

LIBRARIES WHICH PURCHASE DIRECTLY FROM PRODUCER

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	9	7.0
public high school	5	3.9
college	4	3.1
special	3	2.3
junior college	2	1.6
library system	2	1.6
public jr./sr. high school	2	1.6
law	1	.8
medical	1	.8
nonpublic high school	1	.8
public school K-12	1	.8
3R's	1	.8
school library system	1	.8
total	33	25.8

Table 17

LIBRARIES WHICH PURCHASE DIRECTLY FROM AGENTS, DISTRIBUTORS OR JOBBERS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	11	8.6
public high school	7	5.5
public jr./sr. high school	3	2.3
special library	2	1.6
library system	2	1.6
3R's	2	1.6
school library system	2	1.6
army	1	.8
college	1	.8
total	31	24.2

Table 18

AGENTS AND PRODUCERS FROM WHICH SURVEYED LIBRARIES PURCHASE SOFTWARE

agent or producer	kind of library
Apple	library system
Blumenthal's	public jr./sr. high school
Blackwell's North America	college
Compurite Center (White Plains, NY)	public library
Computer Factory Outlet (North Tonawanda, NY)	public library
Computer Room (Glens Falls, NY)	public library
Computer Solutions	public jr./sr. high school
Computer Systems	public library
Computerland	public library
Conroy - La Pointe	public library
800-Software	3R's
Excel, Inc.	special
Follette Software	public high school
Future Information Systems (Apple distributor, Schenectady)	public library
Highsmith	public high school
IBM	special
Ingram Book Co.	public library
Leon's Typewriter (Rochester, NY)	public library school library system

(continued on next page)

Table 18
(Continued)

AGENTS AND PRODUCERS FROM WHICH SURVEYED LIBRARIES PURCHASE SOFTWARE

agent or producer	kind of library
Modern Tek	school library system
Morris Decision	special
North Eastern	public jr./sr. high school
PC Link (New York City)	special
P.S. Software	library system
Radio Shack	public library
Roslin Electronics	school library system
Silicon Express	public jr./sr. high school
Software Center	public library
Software Emporium	public library
Sperry Corp.	library system
SVE	public library
Sydney Development	special
Tandy	library system
Teachers Software Service	public jr./sr. high school
Visual Ed.	school library system

Table 19

OTHER WAYS IN WHICH SOME SURVEYED LIBRARIES ACQUIRE PURCHASED SOFTWARE

intermediary or method	kind of library
Albany-Schenectady-Schoharie BOCES	public library
BOCES bid order	public high school
Library purchased software through a consultant, and also had a custom program written.	special
Ordering is done through central office.	public high school
Southern Tier Library System (STLS)	public library
State contract items/generally ordered by district office.	government law

Table 20

LIBRARIES WHICH HAVE RECEIVED SOFTWARE AS GIFTS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
college	1	.8
junior college	2	1.6
library system	1	.8
medical	1	.8
nonpublic high school	1	.8
public high school	2	1.6
public library	3	2.3
school library system	1 1/3	1.0
total	12 1/3	9.6

Table 21

LIBRARIES WHICH RECEIVED SOFTWARE AS GIFTS IN 1985

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
medical	1	.8
public library	1	.8
school library system	1	.8
total	3	2.3

Table 22

LIBRARIES WHICH RECEIVED SOFTWARE AS GIFTS IN 1984

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
junior college	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 23

LIBRARIES WHICH RECEIVED SOFTWARE AS GIFTS IN 1983

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 24

LIBRARIES WHICH RECEIVED SOFTWARE AS GIFTS IN 1982

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
none	0	0.0
total	0	0.0

Table 25

LIBRARIES WHICH RECEIVED SOFTWARE AS GIFTS IN 1981

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
school library system	1/3	.3
total	1/3	.3

Table 26

LIBRARIES WHICH RECEIVED SOFTWARE AS GIFTS, BUT DID NOT INDICATE YEAR OF DONATION

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	2	1.6
college	1	.8
junior college	1	.8
library system	1	.8
nonpublic high school	1	.8
public high school	1	.8
total	7	5.5

Table 27

LIBRARIES WHICH HAVE BEEN GIVEN SOFTWARE BY INDIVIDUALS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
junior college	1	.8
medical library	1	.8
nonpublic high school	1	.8
public high school	1	.8
school library system	1/3	.3
total	4 1/3	3.4

Table 28

LIBRARIES WHICH HAVE BEEN GIVEN SOFTWARE BY THE ORGANIZATION OR AGENCY OF WHICH LIBRARY IS A PART

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	2	1.6
college	1	.8
junior college	1	.8
library system	1	.8
medical	1	.8
total	6	4.7

Table 29

LIBRARIES WHICH HAVE BEEN GIVEN SOFTWARE BY SOFTWARE PRODUCERS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
school library system	1	.8
total	2	1.6

Table 30

LIBRARIES WHICH HAVE BEEN GIVEN SOFTWARE BY MISCELLANEOUS ORGANIZATIONS

organization	kind of library	frequency	% of total response
Consortia	medical	1	.8
Community Grant through IBM	public library	1	.8
Kiwanis	public library	1	.8
total		3	2.3

Table 31

CHARACTERIZATION OF VARIOUS LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	characterization	frequency	% of total response
army	For public use - very general	1	.8
college	Educational; business; word processing; language	1	.8
college	Present software is for internal, administrative use.	1	.8
college	Public domain software (no games); primarily educationally related; some commercial office related software.	1	.8
college	Software we have is for library staff on internal PC's.	1	.8
college	very small - 4 pieces	1	.8
government law	minimal	1	.8
junior college	Developing.The institution is just starting to enact some policy decisions on the standard kind of computers (IBM) and on siting and user access to hardware and software.We are primarily a funding source at this point.	1	.8
junior college	For library use only	1	.8
junior college	Very limited	1	.8
K-12	Mainly education related; library management	1	.8
law	Westmate - to use on IBM PC to use Westlaw. Lotus - budget abd acquisitions records.	1	.8

(continued on next page)

Table 31
(continued from previous page)

CHARACTERIZATION OF VARIOUS LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	characterization	frequency	% of total response
medical	Minimal - internal use	1	.8
library system	Business applications	1	.8
library system	Business software	1	.8
library system	Software for internal use only; no public access	1	.8
library system	Some purchased, some developed in house	1	.8
nonpublic high school	Almost nonexistent	1	.8
public high school	Computer software collection is average for a collection some years old.	1	.8
public high school	Just 3 or 4 programs related to filing/sorting for library management	1	.8
public high school	Library management, word processing for students, study skills	1	.8
public high school	A little in each curriculum area	1	.8
public high school	Our computer (IBM PC AT) is used mainly for management purposes.	1	.8
public high school	Our collection is basically for library management.Each department has its own software collection, that is not processed by the library (unfortunately)	1	.8
public high school	Our software is oriented to library research skills and library management.	1	.8
public high school	Small, but growing	1	.8

(continued on next page)

Table 31
(continued from previous page)

CHARACTERIZATION OF VARIOUS LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	characterization	frequency	% of total response
public high school	Software programs in Apple, IBM and Atari format. Greatest percentage is CAI with the next greatest concentration in applications: teacher utilities, word processing, databases, etc.	1	.8
public high school	We have only 3 programs on library management: overdues, accessions and Applewocks. We have an A.V. Dept. which holds and circulates all records, tapes, etc.	1	.8
public high school	Word processing software; computer assisted instruction software; utility programs.	1	.8
public jr./sr. high school	We have some for library management (Bookworm, cat. card writer, PFS Write, File). We have microzim for the students. We are using some MECC and some commercial software for curriculum, e.g. Math Blasten. Students and staff use PFS Write.	1	.8
public jr./sr. high school	Word processing; data base management; utilities such as Printshop; educational	1	.8
public library	Administrative, games, mailing, posters	1	.8
public library	Administrative only at present	1	.8
public library	Basically literacy related and CAI materials	1	.8

(continued on next page)

Table 31
(continued from previous page)

CHARACTERIZATION OF VARIOUS LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	characterization	frequency	% of total response
public library	The collection for the Apple IIe consists of data base, file management, word processing, graphics, typing tutorial programs. The IBM PC is solely for library administrative use and the collection consists of data base and word processing programs.	1	.8
public library	Current collection is approx. 63% applications programs and database managers with the remainder being educational programs. Expected growth area for 1986 is educational games targeted for ages 9-17 yrs.	1	.8
public library	Educational, business	1	.8
public library	Educational, including educational games	1	.8
public library	For staff use only	1	.8
public library	Library has an on line bibliographic control and circulation system with an on line public access catalog. This system is operated using Data General minicomputer (MV series). We also have a TRS-80 microcomputer to be used for community organization file and to print address labels. The TRS-80 software is used by the staff only.	1	.8
public library	PFS File, Report; D Base III	1	.8

continued on next page)

Table 31
(continued from previous page)

CHARACTERIZATION OF VARIOUS LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	characterization	frequency	% of total response
public library	Since we acquired our microcomputer 12/23/85, we have only a bare minimum of software, all of which is (1) to train staff and (2) to enable staff to perform library tasks on the computer.	1	.8
public library	Small, basic	1	.8
public library	Strictly limited to office and technical services procedures	1	.8
public library	To fit our new IBM PC Jr. - for public use	1	.8
public library	Very basic, emphasis on computer literacy and programs that are easy to use and go along with software at schools	1	.8
public library	Very small	1	.8
public library	Word processing; filing and library applications - cataloging, circulation, etc.	1	.8
3R's	Administrative	1	.8
3R's	Software purchased is for office administration only.	1	.8
school library system	PFS; Circulation Plus - Follett (sample disk) Bibliofile (sample disk)	1	.8
school library system	Covers subjects taught in K-2 levels such as alphabetizing, reading, math -drill types; supportive of 6th-8th grade curriculum.	1	.8

(continued on next page)

Table 31
(continued from previous page)

CHARACTERIZATION OF VARIOUS LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	characterization	frequency	% of total response
special	All Purpose Symphony 123, Multimark, PC/Focus (database) - a database for our permanent records	1	.8
special	Business applications software	1	.8
special	Organize materials; maintain inventory control; routine correspondence	1	.8
special	Software for routing and keeping track of periodicals	1	.8

END OF TABLE 31

Table 32

LIBRARIES WHICH ARE PARTS OF LARGER INSTITUTIONS, WHICH ACT AS ARCHIVES FOR COMPUTER SOFTWARE RELATING TO THEIR INSTITUTIONAL OPERATIONS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	2	1.6
army	1	.8
library system	1	.8
public library	1	.8
total	5	3.9

Table 33

LIBRARIES WHICH USE REVIEWS FOR SELECTING SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	7	5.5
college	5	3.9
public jr./sr. high school	3	2.3
library system	3	2.3
special	3	2.3
junior college	2	1.6
army	1	.8
government law	1	.8
medical	1	.8
nonpublic high school	1	.8
public school K-12	1	.8
3 R's	1	.8
school library system	1	.8
total	30	23.4

Table 34

LIBRARIES WHICH USE STAFF SUGGESTIONS AS CRITERIA FOR SELECTING SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	17	13.3
public high school	7	5.5
college	5	3.9
public jr./sr. high school	3	2.3
junior college	2	1.6
library system	2	1.6
special	2	1.6
army	1	.8
medical	1	.8
nonpublic high school	1	.8
public school K-12	1	.8
3 R's	1	.8
school library system	1	.8
total	44	34.4

Table 35

LIBRARIES WHICH USE PATRON SUGGESTIONS AS SELECTION CRITERIA FOR SELECTING SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	12	9.4
public high school	3	2.3
college	2	1.6
public jr./sr. high school	2	1.6
army	1	.8
junior college	1	.8
special	1	.8
school library system	1	.8
total	23	18.0

Table 36

LIBRARIES WHICH PREVIEW SOFTWARE BEFORE BUYING IT

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	2	1.6
public jr./sr. high school	2	1.6
college	1	.8
junior college	1	.8
school library system	1/3	.3
total	6 1/3	4.9

Table 37

OTHER CRITERIA USED BY THE VARIOUS SURVEYED LIBRARIES FOR SOFTWARE SELECTION

kind of library	criteria	frequency	% of total response
public library	Articles in computer magazines	1	.8
special	EDP staff evaluations	1	.8
public library	Recommendations from other libraries	1	.8
special	Selected only software for periodical work	1	.8
public high school	Software selected by subject area curriculum directors and administrators	1	.8
public library	Talking with others	1	.8
public library	Recommendations of Computer Science Dept. faculty at SUNY Geneseo	1	.8
government law, medical	Trial of software, i.e., demo disk	2	1.6
junior college, public high school	Faculty recommendations	2	1.6
public library	Recommendations and demonstrations by local computer groups	1	.8
public library	Information from system member libraries	1	.8
public library	Suggestions from Mid-Hudson Library System A-V Dept. Head	1	.8
public library	Peripheral devices required, backup disk of program, operating system, memory requirement, if the software fits the scope of our collection	1	.8

(continued on next page)

Table 37
(continued from previous page)

OTHER CRITERIA USED BY THE VARIOUS SURVEYED LIBRARIES FOR SOFTWARE SELECTION

kind of library	criteria	frequency	% of total response
public library	Recommendations from general projects librarian in charge of automation at our system headquarters	1	.8
government law	Library association meetings & recommendations	1	.8
school library system	Suggestions from 3R's	1	.8
school library system	Suggestions from other coordinators - peers	1	.8
special	Selected by research manager	1	.8
public library	Committee composed of 3-4 librarians, reviews software and makes suggestions for purchase	1	.8
medical	Select software applicable to need; check online sources for reviews of this software. Not reading reviews and then selecting the software.	1	.8
college	A couple of software exchange lists	1	.8
public high school	BOCES preview	1	.8

Table 38

JOURNALS USED FOR SOFTWARE SELECTION

name of journal	frequency	% of total response
Booklist	10 1/3	8.0
SLJ, School Library Journal	6 1/3	4.9
PC, Personal Computing	5	3.9
Electronic Learning	4	3.1
Computing Teacher	4	3.1
Infoworld	4	3.1
Wilson Library Bulletin	3	2.3
Book Report	2	1.6
Byte	2	1.6
EPIE, produced by Consumer Reports	2	1.6
Hot Off the Computer	2	1.6
Microsoft	2	1.6
Publishers Weekly	2	1.6
Small Computers in Libraries	2	1.6
Software Reviews on File	2	1.6
Voya Magazine	2	1.6
A+	1 1/3	1.0
American Libraries	1	.8
Apple	1	.8
B & T Forcasts	1	.8
Business Computer Systems	1	.8

(continued on next page)

Table 38
(continued from previous page)

JOURNALS USED FOR SOFTWARE SELECTION

name of journal	fre-quency	% of total response
Compute!	1	.8
Creative Computing	1	.8
Curriculum Review	1	.8
Data Decisions	1	.8
Legal Reference Services Quarterly	1	.8
Library Hitech	1	.8
Media and Materials	1	.8
Nibble	1	.8
Online	1	.8
Popular Computing	1	.8
PC Magazine	1	.8
PC World	1	.8
Software Digest	1	.8
Software for Libraries	1	.8
Teaching & Computing	1	.8
TESS	1	.8
Apple Software Directory	1/3	.3
Class Computer News	1/3	.3

END OF TABLE

Table 39

LIBRARIES WHICH HAVE APPLICATIONS PROGRAMS, E.G., SPREADSHEETS, WORD PROCESSING PACKAGES

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	19	14.8
public high school	10	7.8
college	4	3.1
public jr./sr. high school	4	3.1
special	4	3.1
library system	3	2.3
junior college	2	1.6
government law	1	.8
law	1	.8
medical	1	.8
public school K-12	1	.8
3R's	1	.8
school library system	1	.8
total	52	40.6

Table 40

LIBRARIES WHICH HAVE DATABASE MANAGERS SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	12	9.4
public high school	7	5.5
college	3	2.3
library system	3	2.3
public jr./sr. high school	3	2.3
special	3	2.3
junior college	2	1.6
government law	1	.8
medical	1	.8
school library system	1	.8
total	36	28.1

Table 41

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE ARCADE GAMES

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 42

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE EDUCATIONAL GAMES SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	10	7.8
public jr./sr. high school	4	3.1
public high school	3	2.3
nonpublic high school	2	1.6
army	1	.8
public school K-12	1	.8
school library system	1	.8
total	22	17.2

Table 43

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE EDUCATIONAL GAME SOSTWARE FOR ALL AGE LEVELS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
army	1	.8
public library	1	.8
total	2	1.6

Table 44

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE EDUCATIONAL GAME SOFTWARE FOR AGE LEVELS 2 - adult

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 45

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE EDUCATIONAL GAME SOFTWARE FOR AGE LEVELS 9-18 YRS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 46

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE EDUCATIONAL GAME SOFTWARE FOR AGE LEVELS 10-18 YRS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
nonpublic high school	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 47

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE EDUCATIONAL GAME SOFTWARE FOR AGE LEVELS 12-14 YRS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public jr./sr. high school	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 48

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE EDUCATIONAL GAME SOFTWARE FOR AGE LEVELS 12-18 YRS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 49

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE EDUCATIONAL GAME SOFTWARE FOR ELEMENTARY GRADE LEVEL

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	3	2.3
total	3	2.3

Table 50

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE EDUCATIONAL GAME SOFTWARE FOR GRADE LEVELS K-6

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	2	1.6
total	2	1.6

Table 51

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE EDUCATIONAL GAME SOFTWARE FOR GRADE LEVELS K-12

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public jr./sr. high school	1	.8
public school K-12	1	.8
school library system	1	.8
total	3	2.3

Table 52

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE EDUCATIONAL GAME SOFTWARE FOR PRIMARY-12th GRADE LEVELS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 53

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE EDUCATIONAL GAME SOFTWARE FOR 7th-12th GRADE LEVELS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
nonpublic high school	1	.8
public high school	1	.8
public jr./sr. high school	1	.8
total	3	2.3

Table 54

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE EDUCATIONAL GAME SOFTWARE FOR 8th-12th GRADE LEVELS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 55

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE CURRICULUM SUPPORTING SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	7	5.5
public jr./sr. high school	4	3.1
college	3	2.3
junior college	2	1.6
public library	1	.8
public school K-12	1	.8
school library system	1	.8
total	19	14.8

Table 56

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE CURRICULUM SUPPORTING SOFTWARE
BY GRADE LEVEES K-12

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public jr./sr. high school	1	.8
public school K-12	1	.8
school library system	1	.8
total	3	2.3

Table 57

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE CURRICULUM SUPPORTING SOFTWARE
BY 3rd-12th GRADE LEVELS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 58

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE CURRICULUM SUPPORTING SOFTWARE
BY 9th-10th GRADE LEVELS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 59

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE CURRICULUM SUPPORTING SOFTWARE
BY 7th-12th GRADE LEVELS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
public jr./sr. high school	1	.8
total	2	1.6

Table 60

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE CURRICULUM SUPPORTING SOFTWARE
BY 9th-12th GRADE LEVELS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	2	1.6
total	2	1.6

Table 61

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE CURRICULUM SUPPORTING SOFTWARE
BY 12 YRS UP AGE LEVEL

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public jr./sr. high school	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 62

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE CURRICULUM SUPPORTING SOFTWARE
BY 12-18 YRS AGE LEVELS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
public jr./sr. high school	1	.8
total	2	1.6

Table 63

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE CURRICULUM SUPPORTING SOFTWARE
BY 14-18 YRS AGE LEVELS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 64

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE CURRICULUM SUPPORTING SOFTWARE
BY HIGH SCHOOL AGE LEVEL

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 65

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE CURRICULUM SUPPORTING SOFTWARE
BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE AGE LEVEL

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
junior college	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 66

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE CURRICULUM SUPPORTING SOFTWARE
BY COLLEGE AGE LEVEL

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
college	1	.8
junior college	1	.8
total	2	1.6

Table 67

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE CURRICULUM SUPPORTING SOFTWARE
BY COLLEGE AGE LEVEL AND UP

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
college	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 68

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE COMPUTER-AIDED INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	7	5.5
public library	5	3.9
college	3	2.3
public jr./sr. high school	3	2.3
army	1	.8
junior college	1	.8
library system	1	.8
public school K-12	1	.8
school library system	2/3	.5
total	22 2/3	17.7

Table 69

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE COMPUTER AIDED INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS FOR AGE 10-ADULT LEVELS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 70

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE COMPUTER AIDED INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS FOR AGES 12 YRS AND UP

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public jr./sr. high school	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 71

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE COMPUTER AIDED INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS FOR AGES 12-18 YRS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 72

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE COMPUTER AIDED INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS FOR AGES 14-18 YRS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 73

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE COMPUTER AIDED INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS FOR HIGH SCHOOL AGE LEVEL

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
public library	1	.8
total	2	1.6

Table 74

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE COMPUTER AIDED INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS FOR ADULTS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	2	1.6
library system	1	.8
total	3	2.3

Table 75

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE COMPUTER AIDED INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS FOR COLLEGE AGE LEVEL

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
college	2	1.6
total	2	1.6

Table 76

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE COMPUTER AIDED INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS FOR COLLEGE AGE LEVEL AND UP

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
college	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 77

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE COMPUTER AIDED INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE AGE LEVEL

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
junior college	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 78

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE COMPUTER AIDED INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS FOR ALL AGE LEVELS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 79

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE COMPUTER AIDED INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS FOR VARIOUS AGE LEVELS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
army	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 80

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE COMPUTER AIDED INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS FOR GRADE LEVELS K-2

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
school library system	1/3	.3
total	1/3	.3

Table 81

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE COMPUTER AIDED INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS FOR GRADE LEVELS K-12

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public jr./sr high school	1	.8
public school K-12	1	.8
total	2	1.6

Table 82

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE COMPUTER AIDED INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS FOR GRADE LEVELS 6-8

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
school library system	1/3	.3
total	1/3	.3

Table 83

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE COMPUTER AIDED INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS FOR GRADE LEVELS 7-12

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
public jr./sr. high school	1	.8
public library	1	.8
total	3	2.3

Table 84

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE COMPUTER AIDED INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS FOR GRADE LEVELS 8-12

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 85

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE COMPUTER AIDED INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS FOR GRADE LEVELS 9-10

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 86

LIBRARIES WHICH ACQUIRE COMPUTER AIDED INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS FOR GRADE LEVELS 9-12

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 87

LIBRARY WHICH HAS SAT PRACTICE SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 88

LIBRARIES WHICH COLLECT COMPUTER SOFTWARE AND HAVE SOFTWARE CATALOGED BY CATALOGING STAFF

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	6	4.7
public jr./sr. high school	3	2.3
public library	4	3.1
college	2	1.6
army	1	.8
nonpublic high school	1	.8
public school K-12	1	.8
special	1	.8
school library system	2/3	.5
total	19 2/3	15.4

Table 89

LIBRARIES WHICH COLLECT COMPUTER SOFTWARE AND HAVE SOFTWARE CATALOGED BY PERSONS OTHER THAN CATALOGING STAFF

kind of library	person doing cataloging	frequency	% of total response
public high school	Cataloging done in central library office.	1	.8
public high school	Computer coordinator for district is a librarian and she catalogs and processes software.	1	.8
public jr./sr. high school	Computer coordinator in computer lab	1	.8
public library	Computer clerk	1	.8
public library	Librarian in charge of programs. She is a children's librarian with responsibilities for cataloging children's materials as well as adult materials.	1	.8
public library	Southern Tier Library System does all our cataloging, book and nonbook.	1	.8
total		6	4.7

Table 90

LIBRARIES WHICH COLLECT COMPUTER SOFTWARE AND HAVE SOFTWARE CATALOGED EITHER BY CATALOGING STAFF OR BY OTHER PERSONS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	8	6.3
public library	7	5.5
public jr./sr. high school	4	3.1
college	2	1.6
army	1	.8
nonpublic high school	1	.8
public school K-12	1	.8
special	1	.8
school library system	2/3	.5
total	25 2/3	20.1

Table 91

LIBRARIES WHICH HAVE COMPUTER SOFTWARE, BUT WHICH DO NOT CATALOG IT

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	13	10.2
library system	4	3.1
college	3	2.3
junior college	3	2.3
public high school	3	2.3
3R's	3	2.3
special	3	2.3
school library system	1 1/3	1.0
government law	1	.8
law	1	.8
medical	1	.8
nonpublic high school	1	.8
total	37 1/3	29.2

Table 92

LIBRARIES WHICH CATALOG SOFTWARE ACCORDING TO THE ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGING RULES, SECOND EDITION, AND ITS REVISIONS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	3	2.3
college	2	1.6
public library	2	1.6
army	1	.8
public jr./sr. high school	1	.8
public school K-12	1	.8
school library system	2/3	.5
total	10 2/3	8.3

Table 93

LIBRARIES WHICH DO NOT CATALOG SOFTWARE ACCORDING TO THE ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGING RULES, SECOND EDITION, BUT FOLLOW SOME OTHER GUIDELINES FOR CATALOGING

kind of library	guideline	frequency	% of total response
public library	Collection is not cataloged conventionally. Each piece is numbered (A-001, A-002, etc) (A is for Apple. We are to re-evaluate when and if our collection grows to 50 pieces. We provide list by broad subject.	1	.8
public library	Common sense	1	.8
public jr./sr. high school	We do simple, common sense cataloging using Dewey.	1	.8
public high school	Dewey decimal classification, and Sears List of subject headings	1	.8
public jr./sr. high school	Dewey decimal classification, and Sears List of subject headings	1	.8
public high school	No particular pattern	1	.8
total		6	4.7

Table 94

SOME REASONS GIVEN FOR NOT CATALOGING COMPUTER SOFTWARE

kind of library	reason	frequency	% of total response
junior college	Presently it is listed in a microcomputer software inventory.	1	.8
public library	We list them, not catalog them.	1	.8
college	Have not begun cataloging the material yet. We are just beginning to acquire software.	1	.8
medical	Small collection not yet cataloged	1	.8
public high school	We only have a few programs. If we ever order more, we will catalog. Teachers (who obtain educational software through departments) will place a program on reserve and students will use them in the library on one of our three computers.	1	.8
library system	Mostly in-house use (staff)	1	.8
public high school	Our computer (IBM PC AT) is used mainly for management purposes.	1	.8

Table 95

LIBRARIES WHICH ARRANGE SOFTWARE BY DEWEY CLASSIFICATION NUMBER

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	6	4.7
public jr./sr. high school	3	2.3
public library	3	2.3
army	1	.8
public school K-12	1	.8
school library system	2/3	.5
total	14 2/3	11.5

Table 96

LIBRARIES WHICH ARRANGE SOFTWARE BY LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CLASSIFICATION NUMBER

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
college	2	1.6
total	2	1.6

Table 97

LIBRARIES WHICH ARRANGE SOFTWARE BY BOTH LIBRARY OF CONGRESS AND NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE CLASSIFICATION NUMBERS

kind of library	circumstances	frequency	% of total response
special	LC and NLM, basic and clinical respectively	1	.8
total		1	.8

Table 98

LIBRARIES WHICH ARRANGE THEIR SOFTWARE BY ACCESSION NUMBER

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	5	3.9
junior college	1	.8
nonpublic high school	1	.8
special	1	.8
total	8	6.3

Table 99

LIBRARIES WHICH KEEP THEIR SOFTWARE AT THE COMPUTER

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	2	1.6
library system	1	.8
special	1	.8
total	4	3.1

Table 100

LIBRARIES WHICH HOUSE THEIR SOFTWARE SEPARATELY FROM THEIR BOOK COLLECTIONS

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	17	13.3
public high school	9	7.0
public jr./sr. high school	4	3.1
college	3	2.3
special	3	2.3
junior college	2	1.6
nonpublic high school	2	1.6
library system	2	1.6
army	1	.8
medical	1	.8
public school K-12	1	.8
school library system	1	.8
total	46	35.9

Table 101

LIBRARIES WHICH KEEP ALL THE COMPONENTS OF A SOFTWARE PACKAGE TOGETHER

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	12	9.4
public high school	8	6.3
college	3	2.3
public jr./sr. high school	3	2.3
special	3	2.3
junior college	2	1.6
library system	2	1.6
nonpublic high school	2	1.6
army	1	.8
law	1	.8
public school K-12	1	.8
school library system	1	.8
total	39	30.5

Table 102

LIBRARIES WHICH SEPARATE ACCOMPANING MATERIALS FROM DISKETTES OR TAPES

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	5	3.9
medical	1	.8
public high school	1	.8
public jr./sr. high school	1	.8
special	1	.8
total	9	7.0

Table 103

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT LIBRARY STAFF
ARE THE MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
college	3	2.3
government law	1	.8
junior college	1	.8
law	1	.8
library system	2	1.6
medical	1	.8
public high school	5	3.9
public jr./sr. high school	1	.8
public library	11	8.6
school library system	1	.8
special	4	3.1
total	31	24.2

Table 104

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT STUDENTS
ARE THE MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
college	1	.8
junior college	1	.8
nonpublic high school	1	.8
public high school	2	1.6
public jr./sr. high school	2	1.6
public library	4	3.1
school library system	1/3	.3
total	11 1/3	8.9

Table 105

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
ARE THE MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	2	1.6
public school K-12	1	.8
school library system	1/3	.3
total	3 1/3	2.6

Table 106

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT THE GENERAL PUBLIC
ARE THE MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
army	1	.8
public library	2	1.6
total	3	2.3

Table 107

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT COMPUTER USER CARD HOLDERS
ARE THE MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 108

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT HOSPITAL STAFF
ARE THE MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
special	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 109

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT STAFF
ARE THE MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 110

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT THE GENERAL PUBLIC ARE THE SECOND MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
library system	1	.8
public library	7	5.5
total	8	6.3

Table 111

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT LIBRARY STAFF ARE THE SECOND MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public jr./sr. high school	2	1.6
public library	3	2.3
school library system	1/3	.3
special	1	.8
total	6 1/3	4.9

Table 112

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF ARE THE SECOND MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
college	2	1.6
public high school	2	1.6
public jr./sr. high school	1	.8
public library	1	.8
total	6	4.7

Table 113

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT TEACHERS ARE THE SECOND MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	2	1.6
school library system	1/3	.3
total	2 1/3	1.8

Table 114

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT STAFF ARE THE SECOND MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
army	1	.8
nonpublic high school	1	.8
total	2	1.6

Table 115

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT FACULTY ARE THE SECOND MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
college	1	.8
school library system	1/3	.3
total	1 1/3	1.1

Table 116

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT THEIR COMPUTER STAFF ARE THE SECOND MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 117

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT HOSPITAL STAFF ARE THE SECOND MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
medical	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 118

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT OTHER EMPLOYEES ARE THE SECOND MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
special	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 119

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT OTHER STAFF ARE THE SECOND MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
special	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 120

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT PATRONS ARE THE SECOND MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
law	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 121

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT LIBRARY STAFF ARE THE THIRD MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	3	2.3
public library	1	.8
school library system	1/3	.3
total	4 1/3	3.4

Table 122

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT STUDENTS ARE THE THIRD MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
public jr./sr. high school	1	.8
public library	1	.8
school library system	1/3	.3
total	3 1/3	2.6

Table 123

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF ARE THE THIRD MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public jr./sr. high school	2	1.6
public library	1	.8
total	3	2.8

Table 124

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT THE GENERAL PUBLIC ARE THE THIRD MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	2	1.6
total	2	1.6

Table 125

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT COMPUTER USER GROUPS ARE THE THIRD MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 126

LIBRARIES WHICH REPORT SUPPORT STAFF ARE THE THIRD MOST FREQUENT USER TYPE OF LIBRARIES' SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
college	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 127

LIBRARIES WHICH PERMIT SOFTWARE TO CIRCULATE
(OF THE 65 LIBRARIES WHICH HAVE SOFTWARE)

kind of library	totals	frequency of libraries which permit circulation	frequency of libraries which do not permit circulation	no answer frequency
army	1	1	0	0
college	5	1	3	1
government law	1	0	1	0
junior college	3	1	2	0
law	1	0	1	0
library system	4	0	2	2
medical	1	0	1	0
nonpublic high school	2	0	1	1
public high school	11	3	8	0
public jr./sr. high school	4	2	2	0
public library	21	0	17	4
public school K-12	1	0	1	0
3 R's	3	0	0	3
school library system	2	2/3	1/3	1
special library	5	0	4	1
total of libraries which have software	65	8 2/3	43 1/3	13

Table 128

LIBRARIES WHICH HAVE MAINTENANCE PROBLEMS WITH SOFTWARE AND LIBRARIES WHICH DO NOT HAVE MAINTENANCE PROBLEMS WITH SOFTWARE

kind of library	totals	frequency of libraries which have maintenance problems*	frequency of libraries which do not have maintenance problems*	no answer frequency*
army	1	0	1	0
college	5	0	1	4
government law	1	0	1	1
junior college	3	0	2	1
law	1	0	0	1
library system	4	0	2	2
medical	1	0	0	1
nonpublic high school	2	0	0	2
public high school	11	2	5	4
public jr./sr. high school	4	2	0	2
public library	21	1	12	8
public school K-12	1	1	0	0
school library system	2	2/3	1/3	1
special library	5	0	3	2
3 R's	3	0	0	3
total of libraries which have software	65	6 2/3	27 1/3	32

*Table has not been percentaged because of the low frequency of maintenance problems and the large frequency of no answers.

Table 129

LIBRARIES WHICH HAVE 1-20 DISKETTES

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
college	1	.8
junior college	1	.8
public high school	3	2.3
public library	4	3.1
3 R's	1	.8
special	1	.8
total	11	8.6

Table 130

LIBRARIES WHICH HAVE 21-78 DISKETTES

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
college	2	1.6
public library	3	2.3
school library system	1/3	.3
special	1	.8
total	6 1/3	5.0

Table 131

LIBRARIES WHICH HAVE 125-200 DISKETTES

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
army	1	.8
library system	1	.8
public jr./sr. high school	1	.8
public library	1	.8
total	4	3.1

Table 132

LIBRARY WHICH HAS APPROXIMATELY 600 DISKETTES

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 133

LIBRARIES WHICH HAVE 4-40 PROGRAMS IN DISKETTE FORMAT

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
public jr./sr. high school	1	.8
public library	2	1.6
total	4	3.1

Table 134

LIBRARIES WHICH HAVE 100-117 PROGRAMS IN DISKETTE FORMAT

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
public school K-12	1	.8
school library system	1/3	.3
total	2 1/3	1.8

Table 135

LIBRARY WHICH HAS 321 PROGRAMS IN DISKETTE FORMAT FOR APPLE, ATARI, IBM

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 136

LIBRARY WHICH HAS 150 DISKS AND DISKETTES

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 137

LIBRARIES WHICH HAVE 100% OF THEIR SOFTWARE IN DISKETTE FORMAT, BUT DID NOT INDICATE NUMBER OF PROGRAMS OR PIECES

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
public library	1	.8
special	1	.8
total	3	2.3

Table 138

LIBRARY WHICH HAS 4 PACKAGES ONLY, BUT DID NOT SPECIFY FORMAT

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
special	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 139

LIBRARIES WHICH HAVE SOFTWARE IN DISK FORMAT AND HAVE 5-99 PIECES

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
college	1	.8
public high school	1	.8
public library	3	2.3
total	5	3.9

Table 140

LIBRARY WHICH HAS 1 PROGRAM OF VISIFILE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 141

LIBRARY WHICH HAS $300.00 OF BPI PAYROLL

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 142

LIBRARY WHICH HAS $150.00 OF PFS FILE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 143

LIBRARY WHICH HAS $150.00 OF PFS WRITE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 144

LIBRARY WHICH HAS 100% APPLICATIONS SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
junior college	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 145

LIBRARY WHICH HAS THREE PROGRAMS OF BUSINESS SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 146

LIBRARY WHICH HAS 40 PROGRAMS OF EDUCATIONAL SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 147

LIBRARY WHICH HAS 4 PROGRAMS OF LIBRARY SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 148

LIBRARY WHICH HAS 1 PROGRAM OF LIBRARY CATALOGING SOFTWARE

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 149

LIBRARY WHICH HAS 1 PROGRAM FOR WORD PROCESSOR

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 150

LIBRARIES WHICH HAVE 1-10 PROGRAMS IN CASSETTE FORMAT

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public high school	1	.8
public library	1	.8
public school K-12	1	.8
school library system	1	.8
total	4	3.1

Table 151

LIBRARY WHICH HAS 16 SOFTWARE TAPES

kind of library	frequency	% of total response
public library	1	.8
total	1	.8

Table 152

LIBRARIES WITH PLANS TO COLLECT OR NOT TO COLLECT MICROCOMPUTER SOFTWARE AND WITH PLANS TO COLLECT OR NOT TO COLLECT COMPUTER SOFTWARE

kind of library	Surveyed libraries With Software f*	Without Software f	Plans to begin collecting Micro-computer software** 1986 f	1987 f	No f	Plans to begin collecting computer software in "near future" ** Yes f	No f
army	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
college	5	3	1	0	1	0	0
government	0	2	0	0	0	1	0
government law	1	1	0	0	1	0	0
junior college	3	3	0	0	2	0	1
law library	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
library system	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
medical	1	6	2	0	2	0	2
nonpublic high school	2	2	0	1	1	0	0
public high school	11	4	0	0	2	0	2
public jr./ sr. high school	4	2	0	0	0	0	0
public library	21	16	1	2	6	1	7
public school K-12	1	2	0	0	2	0	2
3 R's	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
school library system	2	2	0	0	1	0	0
special library	5	20	2	0	13	0	11
total	65	63	6	3	31	2	25

*f=frequency **This table represents multiple responses; an individual library may have one or more responses.

INTERPRETATIONS AND CONCLUSION

It will be noticed that many of the tables which include references to school library systems include frequencies with the fractions of 1/3 or 2/3. The reason for this is that the school library system coordinator of one of the school library systems surveyed in this study sent copies of this surveyor's questionnaire to three representative member libraries in her system. These member libraries were an elementary school library, a middle school library, and a high school library. All three member libraries returned their copies of the questionnaire. Their individual responses have been tabulated as responses from a school library system.

128 responses out of 154 mailed questionnaires were returned. The response rate was 83.1%. 65 or 50.8% of the responding libraries indicate they have some kind of software, either for staff use, or for both staff and patron use.

Only 5 (20%) of responding special libraries indicate they have software.

1 out of 1 responding army library indicates it has software. 1 out of 1 nongovernmental law library indicates it has software. 4 out of 4 responding library systems indicate they have software. 3 out of 3 responding 3 R's systems indicate they have software. In all these instances, 100% of the respondents have software.

11 (73.3%) of 15 responding public high school libraries indicate they have software. 4 (66.7%) of 6 responding public

junior/senior high schools indicate they have software.

21 (56.8%) of responding public libraries indicate they have software.

1 out of 2 responding government law libraries, 3 out of 6 responding junior college libraries, 2 out of 4 responding nonpublic high school libraries, 2 out of 4 responding school library systems indicate they have software. In these cases, 50% of the responding library types have software.

1 (33.3%) of 3 responding public schools K-12 has software.

1 (14.3%) of 7 responding medical libraries has software.

Although 65 (50.8%) of the 128 responding libraries indicate they have software, only 56 (43.8%) indicate they purchase software. How can this 7% discrepancy be explained? 12 1/3 (9.6%) of the responding libraries received software as gifts. Could this partially account for the difference? Another explanation could be that libraries which purchase hardware for library management, business purposes, or data base management consider the software to be part of their equipment purchase and not a separate item of purchase. A glance at Table 15a will indicate there was a steady increase in the number of libraries which purchase software.

Public libraries were the first kind of library to begin purchasing software in 1979. A library system, a 3 R's system, and 1/3 of a school library system were the next types to begin purchasing software in 1981. A junior college and a public high school were the next kinds of libraries to begin

purchasing software in 1982. It was not until 1983 when the numbers of libraries which purchase software significantly increased. During 1983, 3 public high school libraries, 3 junior/senior high school libraries, 1 library system and 2/3 of a school library system purchased software.

In 1984, 1 college library, 1 law library, 1 nonpublic high school library, 2 public high school libraries, 1 public junior/senior high school library, 4 public libraries, 1 public school K-12 library, and 1 special library purchased software.

The greatest number of libraries purchased software in 1985. 1 government law library, 1 medical library, 1 school library system, 2 college libraries, 2 public high school libraries, 3 special libraries and 7 public libraries purchased software in 1985.

Only 1 library purchased software in 1986. This one library is an army library. This lower frequency was partially caused by the fact this survey was conducted in the first part of 1986.

3 or 2.3% of the responding libraries have been given software by miscellaneous organizations. 1 medical library had been given software by a consortia. 1 public library had received software from a community grant through IBM, and another public library had been given software by the Kiwanis. If a public library could develop a forceful argument for needing software, it might be possible to receive a grant from industry or from a public service organization.

1 public library and 1 school library system, 1.6% of the total response, were given software by software producers.

2 public libraries, 1 college library, 1 junior college library, 1 library system and 1 medical library were given software by the organizations or agencies of which they are a part. This is 4.7% of the 128 responding libraries.

33 (58.9%) of the 56 libraries which purchase software, purchase directly from software producers. 31 (55.4) of libraries which purchase software, purchase from agents or distributors or jobbers. Some libraries purchase both directly from producers and from agents, distributors or jobbers.

Question no. 4 of this surveyor's questionnaire asked libraries to characterize their software collections. Individual responses to this question were reported in Table 31 of this paper. There were 56 individual responses. Many responses included more than one category. 30 libraries indicated they have software for internal, administrative use. If this frequency is percentaged with the 65 libraries which indicated they have software, the percentage is 46.2%; if this frequency is percentaged with the 56 libraries which indicate they purchase software, the percentage is 53.6%. 7 libraries indicate they have business software. The respective percentages are 10.8% (of libraries which have software) or 12.5% (of libraries which purchase software). If it is considered that business software is to be used for internal administra-

tive use, then this combined category becomes much larger. 37 libraries have software for both internal administrative use and for business use. The respective percentages are 56.9 (libraries having software) and 66% (libraries purchasing software).

16 libraries have education software. The respective percentages are 24.6% (libraries having software) and 28.6% (libraries purchasing software).

11 libraries report having word processing software. The respective percentages are 16.9% (libraries having software) and 19.6% (libraries purchasing software).

9 libraries report having minimal software. The respective percentages are 13.8% and 16%.

5 libraries have data base managers. The respective percentages are 7.7% and 8.9%.

1 library reports having games. The respective percentages are 1.5% and 1.8%.

Only 5 or 3.9% of all responding libraries act as computer archives for computer software relating to their institutional operations. The libraries which act in this capacity are 2 public high school libraries, 1 army library, 1 library system and 1 public library.

The most frequently used criteria for selecting software is staff suggestions. 44 libraries or 34.4% of all responding libraries use this method of selecting software. When this frequency is percentaged against the 56 libraries which indicate they purchase software, the percentage is 78.6%

The second most popular method for selecting software is reading reviews in journals. 30 or 23.4% of responding libraries indicate they use this method. When this frequency is percentaged with the 56 libraries which purchase software the percentage becomes 53.6%.

The third most used criterion for selecting software is patrons' suggestions. 23 libraries use this standard. The respective percentages are 17.9% and 41%.

The fourth most used criterion for purchasing software is previewing the software before buying it. 6 1/3 libraries use this method. The respective percentages are 4.9% and 11.3%.

The criteria of individual libraries are listed in Table 37 of this paper.

The journals reported by the surveyed libraries to be the most frequently used for selecting software are the Booklist, SLJ; School Library Journal, PC; Personal Computing, Electronic Learning, the Computing Teacher and the Wilson Library Bulletin. These journals as well as less frequently used selection tools are listed in Table 38 of this paper.

When one compares the answers to question 4 (Can you characterize your library's software collection?) with the responses to question 8 (What kinds of software do you acquire?), the similarity in response is not surprising. 52 or 40.6% of all responding libraries have applications programs. When this frequency is percentaged with the 56 libraries which purchase software, the percentage is 92.9%.

36 libraries have data base managers. The respective percentages are 28.1% (responding libraries) and 64.3% (libraries which purchase software).

22 libraries acquire educational games software. The respective percentages are 17.2% and 39.3%.

19 libraries acquire curriculum supporting software. The respective percentages are 14.8% (responding libraries) and 33.9% (libraries which purchase software).

Only 1 library acquires arcade games. The respective percentages are .8% and 1.8%.

22 2/3 libraries acquire computer aided instruction programs. The respective percentages are 17.7% (responding libraries) and 40.5% (libraries which purchase software).

19 2/3 libraries have software cataloged by cataloging staff. The respective percentages are 15.4% (responding libraries) and 35.1% (libraries which purchase software).

6 libraries have software cataloged by persons other than cataloging staff. The respective percentages are 4.7% (responding libraries) and 10.7% (libraries which purchase software).

When one adds the two frequencies of libraries which have their software cataloged by cataloging staff and those libraries which have their software cataloged by other individuals, one arrives at the total of 25 2/3 libraries which have their software cataloged. 20.1% of responding libraries catalog their software and 45.8% of libraries which purchase software have their software cataloged.

10 2/3% of responding libraries catalog their software according to the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. When this frequency is percentaged with the 56 libraries which purchase software, the percentage is 19%.

6 or 4.7% of responding libraries catalog their software following guidelines other than the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. When this frequency is percentaged with the 56 libraries which purchase software, the percentage becomes 10.7%.

37 1/3 or 29.2% of all responding libraries have computer software, but do not catalog it. When this frequency is compared with the 56 libraries which purchase software, the percentage becomes 66.7%.

14 2/3 or 11.5% of responding libraries arrange their software by Dewey Classification number. When this frequency is percentaged over the 56 libraries which purchase software, the percentage becomes 26.2%.

1 medical library arranges its clinical software by National Library of Medicine classification number. The respective percentages are .8% and 1.8%.

8 or 6.3% of responding libraries arrange their software by accession number. When this frequency is percentaged over the libraries which purchase software, the percentage becomes 14.3%.

4 or 3.1% of responding libraries keep their software at the computer. When calculated against the frequency of 56 libraries which purchase software, this becomes 7.1%.

46 or 35.9% of responding libraries house their software separately from their book collections. When calculated over the frequency of 56 libraries which purchase software, the percentage becomes 82.1%.

39 or 30.5% of responding libraries keep all the components of a software package together. When calculated over the frequency of 56 libraries which purchase software, this becomes 69.6%.

9 or 7% of responding libraries separate accompaning material from the diskettes or tapes. This is 16% of libraries which purchase software.

The most frequent user types of surveyed libraries' software are library staff. The frequency is 31 or 24.2% of responding libraries or 55.4% of libraries which purchase software.

The second largest group of the most frequent user types of libraries' software is students. The frequency is 11 1/3 and the respective percentages are 8.9% and 20.2%.

The fourth largest most frequent user type of libraries' software is instructional staff. The frequency is 3 1/3. The respective percentages are 2.6% and 6%.

The smallest groups of most frequent user types of libraries' software are computer user card holders, hospital staff and staff. The frequency of each of these categories is 1. The respective percentages are .8% and 1.8%.

The largest group of second most frequent user type of

libraries' software is the general public. The frequency is 8. The respective percentages are 6.3% and 14.3%.

The second largest group of second most frequent user type of libraries' software is library staff. The frequency is 6 1/3 and the respective percentages are 4.9% and 11.3%.

The third largest group of second most frequent user type of libraries' software is instructional staff. The frequency is 6. The respective percentages are 4.7% and 10.7%.

The fourth largest group of second most frequent user type is teachers. The frequency is 2 1/3 and the respective percentages are 1.8% and 4.2%.

The fifth largest group of second most frequent user type of libraries' software is staff. The frequency is 2. The respective percentages are 1.6% and 3.6%.

The sixth largest group of second most frequent user type of libraries' software is faculty. The frequency is 1 1/3. The respective percentages are 1% and 2.4%.

The smallest group of second most frequent user type of libraries' software are computer staff, hospital staff, other employees, other staff and patrons. The frequency for each user type is 1. The respective percentages are .8% and 1.8%.

The largest group of the third most frequent user type of libraries' software is library staff. The frequency is 4 1/3. The respective percentages are 3.4% of total response and 7.7% of libraries which purchase software.

The second largest group of the third most frequent user type of libraries' software are students. The frequency is 3 1/3. The respective percentages are 2.6% of the total reponse and 6% of libraries which purchase software.

The third largest group of the third most frequent user type of libraries' software are instructional staff. The respective percentages are 2.3% of responding libraries and 5.4% of libraries which purchase software.

The fourth largest group of the third most frequent user type of libraries' software are the general public. The frequency is 2. The respective percentages are 1.6% of responding libraries and 3.6% of libraries which purchase software.

The smallest groups of the third most frequent user type of libraries' software are computer user groups and support staff. The frequency for each group is 1. The respective percentages are .8% for responding libraries and 1.8% for libraries which purchase software.

Only 8 2/3 or 6.8% of the responding libraries permit software to circulate. This frequency when percentaged over the libraries which purchase software becomes 15.5%.

A much larger number of libraries do not permit software to circulate. The frequency of libraries which do not permit software to circulate is 43 1/3. The respective percentages are 33.9% of the total response and 77.4% of libraries which purchase software.

27 1/3 libraries reported having no maintenance problems. The respective percentages are 21.4% and 48.8%. Three re-

ponses indicated lack of maintenanance problems because the responding libraries had just had their software for a few weeks or months. One response indicated that particular responding library had no software maintenance problems because "a computer clerk is in the Computer Room at all times, ready to lend assistance and prevent abuse." Another library indicated it had no software maintenance problems because "software and hardware are inspected upon return."

6 2/3 libraries indicated they do have maintenance problems. This is 5.2% of all responding libraries and 11.9% of libraries which purchase software. Among the libraries reporting software maintenance problems there is 1 school library which is in a public school for K-12th grades. 2 public high school libraries, 2 public junior/senior high school libraries and 1 public library also reported maintenance problems. As earlier mentioned, the librarian of one of the surveyed school library systems rerouted this surveyor's questionnaire to three of her school system libraries. Two member libraries of this school system reported having software maintenance problems. One is a middle school library and the other is a high school library. The frequency for the middle school library and the high school library were calculated to be 2/3 of a school library system.

4 1/3 of the 6 2/3 libraries which reported maintenance problems with their software indicate their most frequent user type is library staff. 2 libraries indicate their most

frequent users are instructional staff. 1/3 of a school library system responded that students are its most frequent user type.

Some causes of software maintenance problems are:

1. Copying attempts
2. Damaged parts
3. Eventually software breaks down
4. Problems arise from heat, moisture, bad disk drives
5. Software often misplaced
6. Component parts often lost
7. Poor handling habits

3 out of the 6 2/3 libraries reporting software maintenance problems cited copying attempts as a software maintenance problem.

Since this survey was conducted in the early part of 1986, only 1 library reported having begun to collect software in 1986. However, 6 libraries indicated they had plans to begin collecting microcomputer software in 1986. This represents 4.7% of the responding libraries. 31 or 24.2% of the responding libraries indicated they had no plans to begin collecting microcomputer software.

2 or 1.6% of the responding libraries indicated they plan tp begin collecting computer software in the near future. 25 or 19.5% of the responding libraries indicate they have no plans to collect computer software in the near future.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES

Public libraries are the first library type to begin purchasing computer software. 1 public library began purchasing software in 1979. 2 public libraries began purchasing computer software in 1980. A total of 18 public libraries purchase software. This frequency is 14% of all responding libraries, 32.1% of all libraries which purchase software and 48.6% of all responding public libraries.

21 public libraries indicated they have computer software. This frequency is 16.4% of all responding libraries and 56.8% of all public libraries.

7 public libraries catalog their software. The respective percentages are 5.5% of responding libraries and 12.5% of libraries which purchase software and 27.3% of libraries which catalog software.

11 public libraries reported their most frequent software user type is library staff. The respective percentages are 8.6% of responding libraries and 19.6% of libraries which purchase software.

4 public libraries reported their most frequent software user type is students. The respective percentages are 3.1% of responding libraries and 7.1% of libraries which purchase software. 2 public libraries reported the general public is its most frequent user type of software. The respective percentages are 1.6% of responding libraries and 3.6% of libraries which purchase software.

None of the responding public libraries permit their software to circulate outside their buildings.

1 public library reported receiving software as a gift through IBM as a community grant. Another public library reported being given software by the Kiwanis.

PUBLIC SCHOOL LIBRARIES

9 public high school libraries, 4 public junior/senior high school libraries, and 1 public school library for grades K-12 reported purchasing software. The total frequency for these three kinds of school libraries is 14. The respective percentages are 10.9% of responding libraries and 25% of libraries which purchase software. 3 public high school libraries and 3 public junior/senior high school libraries began purchasing software in 1983. The other school libraries purchased software in 1984 or later. 1 library did not report the year it first purchased software.

8 public high school libraries, 4 public junior/senior high school libraries and 1 library for grades K-12 reported they have their software cataloged. The total frequency is 13. The respective percentages are 10.2% of responding libraries, 23.2% of libraries which purchase software, and 50.6% of libraries which catalog software.

5 public high school libraries and 1 public junior/senior library reported library staff are their most frequent user type. The total frequency is 6. The respective percentages 4.7% of responding libraries and 10.7% of libraries which

purchase software. 2 public high school libraries and 2 public junior/senior high school libraries reported their most frequent user type is students. The total frequency is 4. The respective percentages are 3.1% of responding libraries and 7.1% of libraries which purchase software. 2 public high school libraries and 1 public school library for grades K-12 reported instructional staff are the most frequent user type. The total frequency is 3. The respective percentages are 2.3% and 5.4%. 1 public high school reported staff is its most frequent user type. The respective percentages are .8% of responding libraries and 1.8% of libraries which purchase software.

3 public high school libraries and 2 public junior/senior high school libraries permit their software to circulate outside the building. The total frequency is 5. The respective percentages are 3.9% of responding libraries and 8.9% of libraries which purchase software. Public high school libraries, together with public junior/senior high school libraries, form the largest category of libraries which permit software to circulate outside the building.

2 public high school libraries indicated they only have software for library management purposes. 1 of these libraries indicated that each academic department of the high school has its own software collection and that the software collections held by those departments were not processed by the library. The other high school library indicated that software for that school is handled by that school's audio-visual department,

not the library. These two libraries represent 1.6% of all responding libraries and 3.6% of libraries which purchase software.

2 other public high school libraries indicated they don't have any kind of software. 1 library responded that the Math Department has all the software for that high school. The other high school library indicated that all the software for that school is located in the media center. These two high school libraries represent .8% of the total response.

1 public junior/senior high school library reported it has no software. This library's school has a computer coordinator who purchases software for the Math programs and for other subject areas. This 1 public junior/senior high school represents .8% of the total response.

Another public school library for grades K-12 indicated it has no software. However, that library's school does have a computer room which provides access to computer software. This K-12 public school library represents .8% of the total response.

NONPUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES

2 of the nonpublic high school libraries indicated they have software. This frequency is 1.6% of all responding libraries, 3.6% of libraries which purchase software and 50% of all surveyed nonpublic high school libraries. 1 library catalogs its software and arranges its software by accession number. The other library does not catalog its software because its software collection is very small. Both libraries collect educational games.

JUNIOR COLLEGE LIBRARIES

3 junior college libraries indicated they purchase computer software. This frequency is 2.3% of responding libraries, 5.4% of libraries which purchase software, and 50% of the junior college libraries which responded to the questionnaire. None of these junior college libraries catalog their software. 1 junior college library has only applications programs and database managers. These software programs are used 100% by the library staff. Another junior college library indicated it is primarily a funding source for the software used at that particular school. This library indicated it has applications programs and database managers, but that there isn't very much software in the library itself. This junior college library indicated that software is housed in the media center which is a separate component of the library. The computer software is treated as another AV (audio-visual) item and is loaned on a long term basis to the individual academic departments where the hardware is located. A third junior college library indicated it has a very limited collection of curriculum supporting software in diskette, video tape and cassette format which is used by students, but which does not circulate outside the building.

One junior college library which does not purchase any software indicated it has cataloged software for the campus's computer center. Another junior college library which does not purchase any software indicated that the library only

acquires printed material and that there is a learning center on campus which collects some software. The library and the learning center are totally independent of each other.

COLLEGE LIBRARIES

3 out of 8 college libraries reported purchasing software. The respective percentages are 2.3% of responding libraries and 37.5% of college libraries which responded to the survey.

2 other college libraries indicated they have software, but did not indicate purchasing it. Both libraries reported their software is for internal use.

2 college libraries catalog their software. The respective percentages are 1.6% of responding libraries 3.6% of libraries which purchase software and 66.7% of college libraries which purchase software.

3 college libraries reported library staff are their most frequent user type. The respective percentages are 2.3% of responding libraries, 5.4% of libraries which purchase software and 100% of college libraries which purchase software. However, one of these libraries was one which reported having software, but did not indicate purchasing it.

1 college library reported students are its most frequent user type. The frequency is .8% of responding libraries, 1.8% of libraries which purchase software, and 33.3% of college libraries which purchase software.

1 college library reported it permits software to circulate outside the building. The frequency is .8% of respond-

ing libraries, 1.8% of libraries which purchase software, and 33.3% of college libraries which purchase software.

ARMY LIBRARY

There is not enough information to form any conclusions about army libraries. Only 1 army library was surveyed. This 1 army library began purchasing software from an agent in 1986. Its software collection is very general and has been collected for that library's patrons. This army library has educational games for all age levels and computer-aided instruction programs for various age levels. This army library catalogs its software according to the Anglo-American Rules, 2d edition. Software is assigned Dewey decimal classification numbers. The software is housed separately from its book collection and all materials are kept together. The general public is the most frequent user type of this library's software; staff are the second most frequent user type. This army library permits software to circulate outside the building. This army library owned 200 diskettes at the time of the survey.

GOVERNMENT LIBRARIES

Only 2 government libraries responded to this surveyor's questionnaire. Neither library has any computer software. This frequency represents 1.6% of all responding libraries and 100% of government libraries which responded to the survey.

One government library is a federal government library

and has no plans for acquiring software.

The other government library is a county herbarium library. This county herbarium library hopes "to acquire a computer in the future in order to store information on approximately five thousand numbered specimens of two thousand five hundred taxa (species, varieties, forms and cultivars) of plants, mostly trees and shrubs and fifteen thousand herbarium specimens."

GOVERNMENT LAW LIBRARIES

1 government law library purchases software. It has applications programs and database managers for staff use. This library does not catalog its software. This library represents .8% of all responding libraries, 1.8% of libraries which purchase software and 50% of the government law libraries which responded to this survey.

The other government law library which responded to this survey has no software. This library represents .8% of all responding libraries and 50% of the government law libraries which responded to the survey.

LAW LIBRARIES

Only one law library was surveyed. This library is the law library of an insurance company. It represents .8% of all responding libraries, 1.8% of libraries which purchase software, and 100% of surveyed law libraries.

This law library first purchased software in 1984. This law library has Westmate to use on an IBM PC so it can access Westlaw. This law library also has applications programs to

be used on a Lotus microcomputer. This software is used to maintain budget and acquisitions records. This library does not order its software directly. This library does not catalog its software. The components of software packages are kept together. The software is used by both the library staff and the library's patrons. Software is not permitted to circulate outside the building.

This law library depends on the company's Information Systems Department for support in the purchase of software. The Information Systems Department provides assistance to the law library in the review of software. This law library purchases a limited amount of software.

MEDICAL LIBRARIES

All 7 medical libraries included in this survey returned their questionnaires.

Only 1 medical library has software which it first purchased in 1985. This library has also been given software by individuals, by the organization of which it is a part, and by the consortia to which it belongs. Software was first given to this library in 1985.

This frequency of 1 is .8% of all responding libraries, 1.8% of libraries which purchase software, and 14.3% of all responding medical libraries. This library uses reviews, staff suggestions and trials of demo disks for selecting software. This library selects software applicable to need and then checks online sources for review of the required software.

This medical library has applications programs and data base managers. Its software collection was described as minimal for internal use. This medical library's small collec- has not been cataloged. Its software is housed by frequency of use. This medical library houses its software separately from its book collection. The accompanying materials are separated from the software. Individuals are permitted to borrow the manuals, but software is not permitted to circulate outside the building.

99% of this medical library's software users are library staff. The other 1% of software users are hospital staff.

The other six medical libraries did not have any software at the time of this survey.

Another medical library indicated it planned to acquire both applications programs and database managers in 1986. This library indicated it will use reviews, staff suggestions, and patron suggestions for selecting software. This medical library indicated it would use Library Software Review and Library Journal reviews for selecting software. This library indicated it will not catalog its software since the software will be used solely for library operations. However, the librarian who responded to this questionnaire indicated that this library would catalog software according to the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, should the decision ever be made to catalog this library's software. The plans are to house the software separately from the book collection and to keep all the materials together. This library's software will not

be permitted to circulate outside the building. The software collection will be in diskette format.

Another medical library indicated it plans to begin collecting microcomputer software in 1986 or 1987. However, there were no indications of the kinds of software to be acquired, nor the planned uses of the software.

These two medical libraries which plan to begin collecting software in 1986 or 1987 represent 1.6% of all responding libraries and 28.6% of the medical libraries which responded to the survey.

4 medical libraries indicated they have no software. This frequency represents 3.1% of all responding libraries and 57.1% of the medical libraries which responded to this survey.

LIBRARY SYSTEMS

4 library systems were surveyed. All four library systems responded to this surveyor's questionnaire. All four library systems have software for internal use only. None of these library systems catalog their software. This frequency is 3.1% of all responding libraries and 100% of the surveyed library systems. 3 library systems reported they purchase software. This frequency is 2.3% of all responding libraries, 5.4% of libraries which purchase software and 75% of responding library systems.

One library system, which has software for internal use only, responded it does not purchase software.

A second library system responded it uses software in its business operations, but the software is not available for public use. It purchases software from both producers and agents, but did not indicate which agents it uses.

This second library system uses reviews and staff suggestions for selecting software. This library system has applications programs, database managers and computer-aided instruction programs for adults. The software is not cataloged, but it is housed next to the hardware. The software users are 100% staff. The software is not permitted to circulate outside the building. This library system indicated it had no software maintenance problems.

A third library system indicated it had been purchasing software since 1983. This library system purchases both directly from the producer and from agents. It uses the following agents: Tandy, P.S. Software, Sperry Corp. and Apple.

This third library system was given computer software by the organization of which it is a part.

This third library system has business applications software. It also acts as an archive for software relating to institutional operations.

This third library system uses reviews found in various microcomputer publications for selecting software. It also uses staff suggestions for selecting software.

This third library system acquires applications programs and database managers. It does not catalog nor circulate software.

This third library system not only acquires software for its own internal use, but it also acquires software for its member libraries.

The fourth library system reported it has been purchasing software since 1981 and that it buys where most convenient. This library system characterized its software collection as "some purchased, some developed in house."

This fourth library system uses both reviews and staff suggestions for selecting software. The journals used for reviews depend upon the application intended.

This fourth library system acquires both applications programs and data base managers.

The software is in diskette format and consists of approximately 125 pieces. This software is not cataloged because it is used mostly by the staff. The software is housed in the department where it is used and all the materials are kept together.

The library staff uses the software 99% of the time. The general public uses the software 1% of the time.

Software is not permitted to circulate outside the building.

3 R's

Three 3 R's systems were surveyed and all three responded to the questionnaire.

All three 3 R's systems purchase software for administrative purposes. This frequency is 2.3% of all responding libraries, 5.6% of libraries which purchase software, and 100% of surveyed 3 R's systems.

One 3 R's system indicated it began purchasing software in 1981. It purchases directly from producers and from various agents.

This first 3 R's system uses reviews and staff suggesions for selecting software. There was no specification of journals used.

This first 3 R's system's software consists of applications programs.

The second 3 R's system stated it purchases software for office administration purposes and gave no other details.

The third 3 R's system indicated it was just "getting into" microcomputers. It purchases from 800 - Software. This 3 R's system's collection consists of approximately 10 diskettes.

SCHOOL LIBRARY SYSTEMS

Four school library systems responded to this surveyor's questionnaire. This frequency is 3.1% of the total response. Two library systems purchase software. This represents 1.6% of responding libraries, 3.6% of libraries which purchase software and 50% of the responding school library systems. Two school library systems do not purchase software. The respective percentages are 1.6% of the total response and 50% of the responding school library systems.

One school library system began purchasing software in 1985. It does not purchase from the producers, but it does purchase from computer stores such as Modern Tek.

This school library system first received software as a

gift in 1985. It has been given software by software producers.

This school library system characterized its software collection as PFS, Circulation Plus - Follett (sample disk) and Bibliofile (sample disk).

This school library system does not act as an archive for computer software relating to institutional operations.

This school library system uses suggestions from the 3 R's, from other school library system coordinators and peers for selecting software.

The coordinator of the second school library system did not answer the questionnaire herself, but she sent a copy of of the questionnaire to each of three school libraries in her school library system. One school library is an elementary school library, the second is a middle school library and the third is a high school library. All three school libraries returned a completed questionnaire. This surveyor counted the response of each of these school libraries as the response of 1/3 of a school library system.

All three of these school libraries, which represent a school library system, purchase software. The middle school library began purchasing software in 1981. Both the elementary school library and the high school library began purchasing software in 1983. All three school libraries purchase from both producers and agents. All three school libraries purchase from Roslin Electronics in East Rochester and from Leon's in Rochester. The elementary school library also purchases from Visual Education.

The middle school library received its first gift of software in 1981. The software donors have been individuals.

The elementary school library characterized its software as "covers subjects taught in K-2 levels such as alphabetizing, reading, math drill types." The middle school library characterized its software as "supportive of 6th-8th grade curriculum."

All three school libraries use both reviews and staff suggestions as criteria for selecting software. The middle school library indicated "all teachers must preview and evaluate in writing any software purchased."

The elementary school library indicated the Booklist, School Library Journal, and Instructor are used as selection tools for software. The middle school library indicated the School Library Journal is used as a selection tool, but that teachers also read reviews in their subject area journals. The high school library indicated it uses Booklist, Apple Software Directory, Classroom Computing News and A+ as selection tools for software.

All three school libraries have applications programs. The middle school library and the high school library also have data base managers. All three school libraries have educational games for the appropriate grade levels. All three school libraries have curriculum supporting course ware for the appropriate grade levels. Both the elementary school library and the middle school library have computer-aided instruction programs.

The elementary school library does not catalog its software. The software is arranged alphabetically by title under general subject such as reading, math, or writing. Both the middle school library and the high school library catalog their software according to the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. Both libraries use the Dewey decimal classification system.

All three libraries house their computer software separately from their book collections. All three libraries keep all components of a software package together.

The elementary school library indicated its most frequent users are instructional staff and that its second most frequent users are library staff. It does not permit its software to circulate. At the time of this survey, this elementary school had no maintenance problems. The size of the collection was estimated to be 78 diskettes.

The middle school library reported its most frequent users are students. Its second most frequent users are teachers. The third most frequent users are library staff. Teachers and parents are permitted to borrow software.

The middle school library reported it has maintenance problems because attempts to copy the software have often ruined the original software.

This middle school library has 117 program titles in diskette format and 2 program titles in cassette format.

The high school library indicated its software users are library staff (60%), faculty (30%) and students (10%). It permits software to circulate overnight.

This high school library reported it has software maintenance problems resulting from heat, moisture, bad disk drives, and copying attempts. Its software collection is completely in diskette format. There was no mention of the size of the software collection.

The two responding library systems which do not have software, gave no additional information, except one indicated it does not plan to begin collecting microcomputer software in the near future.

SPECIAL LIBRARIES

The surveyed special libraries, which were randomly selected from the American Library Directory, are mostly the libraries of corporations. However, the libraries of some other kinds of organizations are also included in this special library category. For example, one special library is the patients' library of a hospital, another special library is associated with the information service of a consolate, and several special libraries are associated with either societies or with a foundation. Thirty-two special libraries were surveyed and twenty-five responded to the survey. Only five of the responding libraries reported they have software. All five special libraries purchase their software. These five special libraries which purchase software represent 3.9% of all responding libraries, 8.9% of libraries which purchase software, and 20% of the special libraries which responded to this survey.

Only one special library catalogs its software. This

frequency represents .8% of all responding libraries, 1.8% of responding libraries which purchase software, and 20% of the special libraries which purchase software.

The four other special libraries which purchase software do not catalog it. This frequency represents 3.1% of all responding libraries, 7.1% of libraries which purchase software, and 80% of special libraries which purchase software.

Four of the special libraries which purchase software have applications programs. The respective percentages are 3.1% of all responding libraries, 7.1% of libraries which purchase software and 80% of special libraries which purchase software.

Three special libraries have data base managers. This frequency represents 2.3% of responding libraries, 5.4% of libraries which purchase software and 60% of special libraries which purchase software.

The special library, which catalogs its software, began purchasing software in 1985. It purchases both from producers and agents. It purchases from IBM, Excel, Inc. and EXEL. This special library uses its software to organize materials, maintain inventory control, and for routine correspondence. This special library does not act as an archive for computer software relating to institutional operations. It uses reviews, staff suggestions, and patron suggestions for selecting software. This special library uses Library HiTech as a selection tool. The cataloging staff catalogs the software. This library did not indicate which cataloging guidelines are

followed. This special library uses Library of Congress classification numbers for its basic software collection and National Library of Medicine classification numbers for its clinical sciences software collection. The software is housed separately from the book collection. All materials are kept together.

The most frequent software users are hospital staff (90%). The least frequent software users are library staff (10%). The software is not permitted to circulate outside the building. The collection consists of 31 diskettes.

The first special library, which does not catalog its software, purchases software from Sydney Development and from Morris Decision. First year of acquisition was not indicated.

This special library does not act as an archive for computer software relating to institutional relations.

This library has both applications programs and data base managers. This library's most frequent user type is library staff (99%).

The second special library, which does not catalog its software, began purchasing software in 1984. It purchases from both producers and agents. It uses PC Link (New York City) as an agent.

This second special library characterized its software as business applications software.

This second library does not act as an archive for software relating to institutional operations.

This second special library, which does not catalog its software, uses both reviews and staff suggestions for selecting software. It also relies upon EDP staff evaluations. It uses Popular Computing and Data Decisions as selection tools.

This second special library has both applications programs and data base managers. This software is not cataloged. It is kept close to the PC. Accompanying materials are separated from diskettes. The diskettes are stored in a protective storage container. Manuals are housed in staff offices.

Library staff are the most frequent software users (95%). Other staff are the least frequent software users (5%).

Software is not permitted to circulate outside the building. There had been no maintenance problems at the time of this survey.

The software collection consists of an unspecified number of diskettes.

The third special library, which does not catalog its software, began purchasing software in 1985. This library purchased software through a consultant and also had a custom program written.

This library characterized its software as all purpose. It has Symphony 123 and Multimark. It has a PC program written in Focus which is a data base for their permanent records.

This special library does not act as an archive for software relating to its institutional operations.

Software is selected by the research manager. PC World and PC Magazine are used as selection tools.

This third special library, which does not catalog its software, has applications programs and data base managers. The software is housed in a separate shelving section. All materials are kept together with the exception that diskettes are kept in a "Flip N File" unit.

The library staff are the most frequent users of this library's software (90%). Other employees use this library's software 10% of the time.

This library does not permit software to circulate outside the building. It only has four software packages.

The fourth special library, which does not catalog its software, first purchased software in 1985. It purchases software directly from the producer. The software is used for routing and keeping track of periodicals. This special library selects software only for practical work and only has applications programs.

This library does not act as an archive for computer software relating to institutional operations.

Software is arranged by accession number and is housed separately from the book collection. All materials are kept together.

The software is used 100% by library staff. The software is not permitted to circulate outside the building. At the time of this survey, there had been no maintenance problems. This library's software collection consists of approximately 20 diskettes.

Twenty of the special libraries which responded to this

survey do not have any computer software. This frequency represents 15.6% of all responding libraries and 80% of all the special libraries which responded to the survey.

Two of these special libraries indicated they expected to begin collecting microcomputer software later in 1986.

One of these two libraries, which expects to acquire software in 1986, was very specific. Its librarian indicated this library expected to get software for data base searching, for word processing, and for some of their in-house files. This special library expected to obtain the software through the corporation of which it is a part. At the time of the response to this questionnaire, there were no plans for a circulating software collection.

A third special library planned to begin collecting software in 1990.

A fourth special library, which is a very small association library, had applied to a hardware/software producer for a donation of hardware. However, the librarian did not know the outcome of this request.

The remaining 16 special libraries which replied to this survey do not have any software and do not plan to acquire any software. This frequency represents 12.5% of all responding libraries and 64% of all responding special libraries.

Four of these special libraries, which have no plans for acquiring software, are associated with either an arts academy, a foundation, an institute or a society. The book titles in these libraries range from 4,459-40,500. None of these li-

braries is large.

Another group of five special libraries, which have neither software nor plans to acquire software, are a county museum library, an observatory library, a consulate library, an information agency library, and a municipal reference library. Four of these libraries range in size from 6,000 to 20,000 book titles. The fifth library has 250,000 bound volumes and bound periodicals.

Another group of seven special libraries, which have neither software nor plans to acquire software, are company or corporation libraries. These libraries range in size from 1,000 bound volumes to 13,000 book titles. Some of these special libraries serve large companies or corporations.

The seven nonresponding special libraries are one noncompany or noncorporation library and six company or corporation libraries. This special library nonresponse frequency represents 26.9% of all nonresponding libraries and 21.9% of of surveyed special libraries. The American Library Directory does not indicate the size of one library. The other six libraries range in size from 900 book titles to 13,000 book titles and 20,000 volumes (in one collection). Again, some of these special libraries serve large corporations.

None of the responding special libraries indicated they act as archives for computer software relating to institutional operations.

This surveyor was not surprised to find that some small

special libraries, which are associated with neither a company nor a corporation, do not have software and do not plan to acquire software. However, this surveyor was surprised to learn that a number of special libraries, which serve companies or large corporations, do not have software. Neither do they plan to acquire it.

This surveyor wonders whether the disclosure of software or if the disclosure of acting as an archive for computer software relating to institutional operations is regarded as proprietary information. If not, do some other units of companies or corporations act as archives for software relating to institutional operations? Do some other units of companies or corporations have the software which is lacking in some of the libraries which are parts of companies or large corporations?

SURVEYOR'S CRITICISM OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE AND OF THIS SURVEY

The goal of the survey, which was to find out whether some libraries are acquiring significant amounts of software, how they are acquiring it, whether they are cataloging it, how libraries are storing software, and what the maintenance problems are, was accomplished.

However, there could have been some improvements in the wording of some questions and in the tabulation of collected data.

Many respondents answered some parts of question 8 with grade level instead of age level. Perhaps it would have been better to use the term "grade level" instead of age level.

Responding libraries answered question no. 18 many different ways. The responses were so varied it was difficult to tabulate the data. It would have been better to ask how many program titles are in a collection and then to have asked the additional question of how many tapes, diskettes, disks, cassettes, etc. are in a collection.

In retrospect, it would have been useful to learn what kinds of hardware libraries have. There should have been a question concerning the makes, models, and quantity of hardware in libraries. Also there should have been a question concerning which year hardware was first acquired by a library.

If the surveyor had learned how to program a microcomputer, address labels and questionnaires could have been generated by a microcomputer printer. The cover letters and follow

up letters could have been printed the same way. This would have saved a lot of time.

If the surveyor had learned how to program a microcomputer, a lot of data could have been programmed so the collected data could have been tabulated more quickly. Perhaps existing software programs could have been utilized for the tabulation of data.

Even if no data had been tabulated on a microcomputer, some tables in this study could have been consolidated. There are too many tables.

FOOTNOTES

1. Publishers Weekly, Vol. 225, no. 16 (April 20, 1984) p. 58.

2. The Bowker Annual of Library & Book Trade Information, 30th ed. (1985), pp. 426-434.

3. American Association of School Libraries. Committee for Standardization of Access to Library Media "Microcomputer Software and Hardware--an Annotated Source List: How to Obtain, How to Evaluate, How to Catalog, How to Standardize." School Media Quarterly, Vol. 12, no. 2 (Winter 1984), pp. 107-119.

4. Dumlao, Mercedes and Cook, Sherry "Cataloging Software." Special Libraries, Vol. 74, no. 3 (July 1983), pp. 240-245.

5. Nasatir, Marilyn "The Cataloging and Classification of Machine-Readable Data Files. Part I: A Case for Incorporating Records of Machine-Readable Files into the Public Catalog." Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, Vol. 1, no. 1 (Fall 1980), pp. 23-41.

6. Intner, Sheila S. "Suggestions for the Cataloging of Machine Readable Materials." Library Resources & Technical Services, Vol. 27, no. 4 (Oct./Dec. 1983), pp. 366-370.

7. American Library Association. Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access.
Guidelines for using AACR2 Chapter 9 for cataloging microcomputer software. Chicago : American Library Association, 1984. 31 p.

8. Dodd, Sue A. "Changing AACR2 to Accommodate the the Cataloging of Microcomputer Software." Library Resources & Technical Services, Vol. 29, no. 1 (Jan./Mar. 1985), pp. 52-65.

9. Intner, Sheila S. "Problems and Solutions in Descriptive Cataloging of Microcomputer Software." Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, Vol. 5, no. 3 (Spring 1985), pp. 49-56.

10. Nasatir, Marilyn "The Cataloging and Classification of Machine-Readable Data Files. Part III: Subject Description of Machine-Readable Data Files." Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, Vol. 2, no. 3/4 (1982), pp. 45-58.

FOOTNOTES

11. Mitchell, Joan S. " Subject Access to Microcomputer Software." Library Resources & Technical Services, Vol. 29, no. 1 (Jan./Mar. 1985), pp. 66-72.

12. Dodd, Sue A.
Cataloging machine-readable data files : an interpretive manual. Chicago : American Library Association, 1982.
xix, 247 p.

13. Dodd, Sue A. and Sandberg-Fox, Ann M.
Cataloging microcomputer files : a manual of interpretation for AACR2. Chicago : American Library Association, 1985.
272 p.

14. Olson, Nancy B.
Cataloging of audiovisual materials : a manual based on AACR2. 2d ed. Mankato, Minnesota : Minnesota Scholarly Press, c1985.
306 p.

15. Martin, E.
Guidelines for Processing and Cataloging Computer Software for School and Area Education Agencies. 1982.
15 p. ERIC ED 223 256
This publication was developed for the Iowa Department of Public Instruction. It can also be obtained by sending $4.00 to Alice Fite, Executive Director, American Association of School Libraries, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611

16. Talab, Rosemary Sturdevant "Copyright, Micro Software, and the Library Media Center." School Library Media Quarterly, Vol. 12, no. 4 (Summer 1984), pp. 285-288.

17. Walch, David B. "The Circulation of Microcomputer Software in Academic Libraries and Copyright Implications." Journal of Academic Librarianship, Vol. 10, no. 5 (1984), pp. 262-266.

18. Lytle, Susan S. and Hall, Hal W. "Software, Libraries & the Copyright Law." Library Journal, Vol. 110, no. 12 (July 1985), pp. 33-39.

19. Mason, Robert M. "Software Copyright & Copy Protection; Laser Disk Systems at ALA." Library Journal, Vol. 110, no. 15 (Sept. 15, 1985), pp. 58-59.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. American Association of School Libraries. Committee for Standardization of Access to Library Media "Microcomputer Software and Hardware--an Annotated Source List: How to Obtain, How to Evaluate, How to Catalog, How to Standardize." School Media Quarterly, Vol. 12, no. 2 (Winter 1984), pp. 107-119.

2. American Library Association. Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access.
   Guidelines for using AACR2 Chapter 9 for cataloging microcomputer software. Chicago : American Library Association, 1984. 31 p.

3. The Bowker Annual of Library & Book Trade Information, 30th ed. (1985), pp. 426-434.

4. Dodd, Sue A.
   Cataloging machine-readable data files : an interpretive manual. Chicago : American Library Association, 1982. xix, 247 p.

5. Dodd, Sue A. and Sandberg-Fox, Ann M.
   Cataloging microcomputer files : a manual of interpretation for AACR2. Chicago : American Library Association, 1985. 272 p.

6. Dodd, Sue A. "Changing AACR2 to Accommodate the Cataloging of Microcomputer Software." Library Resources & Technical Services, Vol. 29, no. 1 (Jan./Mar. 1985), pp. 52-65.

7. Dumlao, Mercedes and Cook, Sherry "Cataloging Software." Special Libraries, Vol. 74, no. 3 (July 1983), pp. 240-245.

8. Intner, Sheila S. "Problems and Solutions in Descriptive Cataloging of Microcomputer Software." Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, Vol. 5, no. 3 (Spring 1985), pp. 49-56.

9. Intner, Sheila S. "Suggestions for the Cataloging of Machine-Readable Materials." Library Resources & Technical Services, Vol.27, no. 4 (Oct./Dec. 1983), pp. 366-370.

10. Lytle, Susan S. and Hall, Hal W. "Software, Libraries & the Copyright Law." Library Journal, Vol. 110, no. 12 (July 1985), pp. 33-39.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

11. Martin, E.
Guidelines for Processing and Cataloging Computer Software for School and Area Education Agencies. 1982. 15 p. ERIC ED 223 256
This publication was developed for the Iowa Department of Public Instruction. It can also be obtained by sending $4.00 to Alice Fite, Executive Director, American Association of School Libraries, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611

12. Mason, Robert M. "Software Copyright & Copy Protection; Laser Disk Systems at ALA." Library Journal, Vol. 110, no. 15 (Sept. 15, 1985), pp. 58-59.

13. Mitchell, Joan S. "Subject Access to Microcomputer Software." Library Resources & Technical Services, Vol. 29, no. 1 (Jan./Mar. 1985), pp. 66-72.

14. Nasatir, Marilyn "The Cataloging and Classification of Machine-Readable Data Files. Part I: A Case for Incorporating Records of Machine-Readable Files into the Public Catalog." Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, Vol. 1, no. 1 (Fall 1980), pp. 23-41.

15. Nasatir, Marilyn "The Cataloging and Classification of Machine-Readable Data Files. Part III: Subject Description of Machine-Readable Data Files." Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, Vol. 2, no. 3/4 (1982), pp. 45-58.

16. Olson, Nancy B.
Cataloging of audiovisual materials : a manual based on AACR2. 2d ed. Mankato, Minnesota : Minnesota Scholarly Press, c1985. 306 p.

17. Publishers Weekly, Vol. 225, no. 16 (April 20, 1984), p. 58.

18. Talab, Rosemary Sturdevant "Copyright, Micro Software, and the Library Media Center." School Library Media Quarterly, Vol. 12, no. 4 (Summer 1984), pp. 285-288.

19. Walch, David B. "The Circulation of Microcomputer Software in Academic Libraries and Copyright Implications." Journal of Academic Librarianship, Vol. 10, no. 5 (1984), pp. 262-266.

School of Information and Library Science
518/442-5110

Appendix A -- ORIGINAL COVER LETTER

State University of New York at Albany

Draper 113, 135 Western Avenue, Albany, New York 12222

Virginia Yee
ESP Sta.
P.O. Box 2493
Albany, NY 12220
February 6, 1986

Dear

Would you please give me fifteen minutes of your time to help with a research project? I am a graduate student in the Certificate of Advanced Study Program at the School of Information and Library Science at the State University of New York at Albany.

By means of this questionnaire, I am conducting a survey of more than one hundred libraries in the state of New York to learn about their acquisition and treatment of software.

Enclosed is a copy of my questionnaire.

Would you please return the questionnaire in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope by March 20, 1986?

Thank you for your participation in this survey.

Sincerely yours,

Virginia Yee

Enclosure

School of Information and Library Science
518/442-5110

Appendix B -- FOLLOW UP COVER LETTER

• **State University of New York at Albany**

Draper 113, 135 Western Avenue, Albany, New York 12222

Virginia Yee
ESP Sta.
P.O. Box 2493
Albany, NY 12220
March 22, 1986

Dear

Please give me fifteen minutes of your time to assist me with this research project.

I have not received your reply to my questionnaire, concerning the acquisition and treatment of software by libraries, which was mailed to you with a cover letter dated February 6, 1986. If you have already returned this questionnaire, please disregard this letter.

Enclosed are a copy of my original cover letter and questionnaire. Please return the completed questionnaire to me by April 19, 1986.

Thank you for your participation in this survey.

Sincerely yours,

Virginia Yee

TO: Appendix C-- COPY OF SOFTWARE QUESTIONNAIRE

SOFTWARE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Has your library already added computer software to its collection?

   By purchase NO__ YES__ Starting what year?____

   By gift NO__ YES__ Starting what year?____

2. Does your library purchase software directly from producers and agents?

   Purchase directly from producer NO__ YES__

   Purchase from an agent (distributor, jobber) NO__ YES__

   Please list the agent(s) here:

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

3. If your library has been given computer software, in what categories are the donors?

   a) individuals YES__ NO__

   b) the organization/agency of which your library is a part YES__ NO__

   c) software producers YES__ NO__

   d) other:_____

4. Can you characterize your library's software collection?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

5. If your library is a part of a larger institution, i.e. company, university, etc., does the library act as an archive for computer software relating to institutional operations?

   YES__ NO__

6. What criteria does your library use for selecting software?

a) Reviews YES__ NO__

b) Staff suggestions YES__ NO__

c) Patron suggestions YES__ NO__

d) Other selection criteria. Please explain_____

_____

_____

_____

7. If your library uses reviews for selecting software, what journals do you use? Please list the journals used in order of preference:

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. What kinds of software do you acquire? (circle all letters that apply)

Applications programs, e.g., spreadsheets, wordprocessing packages	a
Database managers	b
Arcade games	c
Educational games	d
For what age level?	e
Curriculum supporting courseware	f
For what age level?	g
Computer-aided instruction programs	h
For what age level?	i

9. If your library collects computer software, does your cataloging staff catalog the software?

YES__ NO__ If no, who does your cataloging? Please explain

_____

_____

10. If your library's cataloging staff does catalog your library's software, do they follow the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, Second Edition, and its revisions?

YES__ NO__ If no, what rules or guidelines do they follow?

Please state the guidelines followed:_____

_____

_____

11. How is software arranged in your library?

a) By Dewey decimal classification number? YES__ NO__

b) By Library of Congress Classification number?

YES__ NO__

c) By accession number? YES__ NO__

d) By a scheme not stated above. If yes, please explain:

_____

_____

12. If your library acquires computer software, is it housed separately from your book collection?

YES__ NO__ If no, how do you house it? Please explain:

_____

_____

13. How do you handle the several components of a software package? Check your method for handling software:

All materials are kept together__

Accompaning materials are separated from diskettes or tapes__

14. If the various components of a software package are not kept together, how do you distribute the various components? Please explain:_____

_____

_____

_____

15. Please list, in order, your frequent user types. E.g., library staff, instructional staff, general public, others

(1) _____ _____%

(2) _____ _____%

(3) _____ _____%

(4) _____ _____%

16. Does your library permit your software to circulate outside the building?

NO__ YES__ If yes, what is the loan period? _____

17. Do you have maintenance problems with your software? Please explain:

_____

_____

18. How much software of each major physical type, e.g. diskettes, tapes, cassettes, does your library own at the present time? Please estimate the amount of each kind.

KIND OF SOFTWARE	ESTIMATE OF AMOUNT
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

19. If your library has not yet begun to collect microcomputer software or computer software, have you formulated any plans for the future?

a) Our library expects to begin collecting microcomputer software in: 19___

b) Our library does not expect to begin collecting microcomputer software in the near future. __

c) Our library expects to begin collecting computer software in: 19___

d) Our library does not expect to begin collecting computer software in the near future. __

20. If you would like to receive a copy of this survey when it has been completed, please check here and provide identification information below.

Yes, I would like to receive a copy of this survey: __

Please mail a copy of this survey to:

_____

_____

_____

_____

21. This is optional. If you wish, please list your name, address, and telephone number below:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Telephone no.: ( ) -